TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on Seventh street, opposite Odd Fellows' Hall.

Single copy - - - $2 | Ten copies - - - - $15
Three copies - - - 5 | Single copy six months 1
Five copies - - - 8 | Ten copies six months 8

Daily National Era to the 1st September, $5.

Payment in advance is uniformly required.

Rates of Advertising.—Ten cents a line for the first insertion, five cents a line for each subsequent one.

Money to be forwarded by mail at our risk. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposits. When money is sent, notes on the banks of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, are preferred. New England notes are at less discount than New York State notes, and these less than Western notes.

All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C.*

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1854. NO. 373.

AGENTS

Agents are entitled to fifty cents on each *new* yearly subscriber, and twenty-five cents on each *renewed* subscriber—*except in the case of clubs.*

A club of three subscribers, one of whom may be an old one, at $5, will entitle the person making it up to a copy of the *Era* for three months; a club of five, two of whom may be old ones, at $8, to a copy for six months; a club of ten, five of whom may be old ones, at $15, to a copy for one year.

When a club of subscribers has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms. It is not necessary that the members of a club should receive their papers at the same post office.

The following gentlemen will act as agents in the cities named:

H. B. Knight, 48 Beekman street, New York.
Wm. Alcorn, 826 Lombard street Philadelphia.
G. W. Light, 8 Cornhill, Boston.
J. A. Innis, Salem, Massachusetts.
C. A. Wall, Worcester, Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

REVIEWS.

A Memoir of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Adoniram Judson, D. D. By Francis Wayland, President of Brown University. 2 Vols. Pp. 566, 522. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. Sold by Taylor & Maury, Washington.

This important contribution to the history of missions has long been expected, and the performance has justified the delay. Dr. Judson's life is the story of the commencement of missions by the churches of America in foreign lands. It was the day-dawn of the wide-spread plans of Christian beneficence, which are the glory of our land, expressed not only in Bible Societies, Home Mission Societies, and Foreign Missions, but in every other society which has for its aim and end peace on earth and good will to man.

The incentive to this great work, in the mind of Dr. Judson and his associates, arose from reading the "Star in the East," by the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, whose conversion was one of the fruits of the pastoral labors of the Rev. John Newton, himself a singular expression of God's goodness and long-suffering compassion. The leaven hid in the heart of Judson soon began to heave and expand. He sought the aid of the churches in and around Boston, but they were timid—they could not understand how it could be that they should trust a young man whose wishes were clothed in language of Spartan simplicity: "Give us the means to go, and at the end of some twenty years you may hear of us again." And, with reluctance, the Board of Missions, then recently created, gave Dr. Judson a letter to the well-known Rev. George Burder, of London, proposing to resign Dr. Judson and his friends to the patronage and direction of the London Society. This letter is dated January 3, 1811.

The English Missionary Society declined any joint mission with the American Board; and the Prudential Committee decided to recommend to Dr. Judson and his friend, Samuel Nott, Jr., not to place themselves under the direction of the London Missionary Society, but to wait the further intimations of Providence at home. These were soon manifested in the wishes of the churches that they should be sent forth at their cost and charge. And Dr. Judson sailed, with his friend Newell, on the 18th February, 1812, from Salem. Nott, Hall, and Rice, sailed from Philadelphia on the same day. This, then, is the era of foreign missions of the American churches.

They were all great men, and the last was Dr. Judson, who is destined to be known as the *Apostle to the Burman Empire.*

The history of that mission is a romance, written in part by the beautiful and gifted woman who linked her fortunes with his in 1811, and whose love and devotion is unsurpassed by any heroine delineated in the pages of fiction.

Dr. Judson was a remarkable man. He entered the Empire of Burmah alone, and unsustained by any earthly protection. He had to begin at the beginning of his work—the language was without a grammar or a lexicon. The famous old John Leland, of Berkshire, used to say, "There are many men little enough to be great—there are few men great enough to be little." Dr. Judson's labors as a preacher began so soon as he could speak the language, and it was long before he had any encouragement. "Do you think the prospect bright for the speedy conversion of the heathen?" was a question put to him by a pious man; to which he replied, promptly, "As bright as the promises of God." His faith was always calm, clear, and enduring—his will was indomitable; no disease, no danger, no difficulties or trials, changed for a moment his fixed plans.

Having made himself perfectly familiar with the Burman language, he seemed to prefer it to his native tongue. He was aware that this knowledge imposed upon him the duty of devoting a considerable portion of his time to the work of translation; yet he considered his appropriate business as a missionary to be the preaching of the Gospel. He believed that Christianity was to be promulgated by the contact of individual mind with individual mind. He did not devise any set of measures to operate, as it is said, on the public mind, and change the views of the masses. He had little confidence in schools as a means of the conversion of men. It was sufficient for him to know Christ and his Apostles had made it their great work to proclaim to men everywhere the news of salvation, and he resolutely followed their example.

There is something deeply interesting in facts like these. In these volumes we see one of the most learned and able men in India—that nursery of great men—a man of refined manners and cultivated tastes, surrounded by a company of native Christians who had yet only begun to put off their habits of barbarism, penetrating the recesses of the forest and threading every accessible rivulet, for the sake of preaching to almost naked savages the Gospel of our salvation. Wherever he could find listeners, were they many or few, there he stopped to discourse on the message of redeeming love. Whether from his boat or on the shore, whether by day or by night, he was always ready to reveal to these wandering barbarians the love of God, in sending his Son for our redemption. In this work he was remarkably successful. Rarely did he go into the jungle, without, on his return, "bringing his sheaves with him." And when, at length, he felt constrained, by order of the Board of Missions, to devote himself to the work of translation, it cost him a pang; and the paper which recorded his resolution to forsake the jungle, and devote himself to a life of greater self-indulgence, was bedewed with his tears.

It may interest the readers of this notice to be told that the present results of the Burman mission, from its commencement to 1852-'53, show 88 mission stations, 112 sub-stations, 64 missionaries, 205 native missionaries, 182 churches, and 14,252 members baptized on the profession of their faith and "relations of Christian experience." They have 82 schools, and 2,063 pupils.

Dr. Judson possessed a remarkable facility for calling into actual service all the gifts of native Christians. He saw that a nation can never be evangelized, except by means of its own population. Foreigners can never supply it with ministers of the gospel. Strangers may carry to it the truths of the gospel, may transfer them into its language, and, by the blessing of God, may establish churches. But it is from these churches themselves that the preachers must be taken, who are to carry the gospel to their brethren.

Dr. Judson was for twenty-one months a prisoner in the death-prison, so called, and with all appropriateness, at Ava, and for seventeen months in irons. He was taken out to act as interpreter for the King at Ava, in making the treaty with Sir Archibald Campbell. His death was twice determined on; once by the *Pakanwun*, the leader of the armies, who himself fell suddenly into disgrace, and was executed at an hour's notice; and orders were several times given by the brother to the Queen, who was the real ruler of the Empire, for his "taking off," but the governor of the prison waited for the express order of the King, and so the life of the missionary was saved.

President Wayland, in his admirable chapter on the character and labors of this eminent man, says, "He was endowed with a will of the highest order. It was capable of controlling his physical nature, so that his body would do or suffer whatever it was commanded. It subjected the natural to the spiritual in a degree very rarely attained. * * * He could have made himself a mathematician, a philologist, a diplomatist, a statesman, an impassioned orator, and perhaps a poet, by the strenuous exertion of his will. This is, I think, one of the rarest of human endowments, and it is bestowed only upon men who are eminently gifted. It has seemed to me that the highest range of human talent is distinguished, not by the power of doing well any one particular thing, but by the power of doing well anything we resolutely determine to do."

This is a notice of unusual length for the columns of the *Era*, but it finds its apology in the value of the work, and its bearings upon the advance of the reign of Christ in all the earth. †

Haps and Mishaps of a Tour in Europe. By Grace Greenwood. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields.

The charm of this volume—and everything from the pen of Grace Greenwood has a charm—is a sprightliness and a *naiveté* that disarm criticism, like the laughsome glee of a child, to whom the falling snow, the early spring, the Crystal Palace, the Christmas tree, everything in the world of nature, the world of art, and the little world of home, is a novelty, a mystery, or a poem, yielding some fresh inspiration to eyes that never weary, and to a heart that never aches. Among all the "haps and mishaps" of this year of absence, there was nothing marvellous in the way of adventure, or new in the way of sight-seeing; but to her all was new and marvellous, and the most phlegmatic natures will feel the pulses of that warm, gladsome, womanly heart, and the gushings of its joy, though even its spiritual magnetism may fail to convey to others those "shocks of intense pleasure" that made our author reel in her saddle "with the intoxication of sight," as she rode over the "wondrous Campagna" and gazed upon the "exquisite tints, and infinite shades, and inconceivable brightness" of the "sky of skies."

We like Grace amazingly for her downright honesty; because having a heart, she shows it without restraint, and yet with a true womanly delicacy. We can bear with her ecstatics because they are natural and honest, and therefore meet a response in all true natures. To be sure she "piles up the agony" in presence of the Apollo Belvidere and the Dying Gladiator, and tries the full force of that part of speech known as the adjective; but it is always a natural emotion, even when wrought to its highest ecstacy, and is never put on for effect. To be sure she tells us how she felt, rather than what she saw—or she describes objects through her own emotions; but then it is pleasant and stimulating to know how such a mind was affected by nature, society, art, and religion, in the Old World—a pleasure next to that of seeing with one's own eyes. It is like listening to music from an invisible band on the still night air.

A downright honesty of opinion, too, she has, and utters it with the strength and feeling of a woman's heart. We would give more for one page of her instinctive repulsion at the Papal system, as an imposition upon the chaste simplicity of a true devotion, than for a whole volume of invective from Kirwan.

Most heartily do we commend the book to all lovers of genuine sentiment, of refined and poetic feeling, of genial, sprightly narrative, and of pure religious principle.

The above appreciative notice we find in the New York *Independent.* It is, we presume, from the pen of Henry Ward Beecher. We heartily concur in its encomium of an exceedingly pleasant volume of Travels, than which nothing more racy and readable has been issued from the press this season. If the author's record of impressions abroad is not always as grave, classic, and well-considered as that of Hilliard's "Six Months in Italy," it is fresher, freer, warmer—nay, a more earnest individuality.

It bears on every page ample evidence that she has been true to her own convictions; that she saw with her own eyes, and uttered her own thoughts. It is very pleasant and exhilarating to read a book of European travel, which is not a mere intellectual survey of life, art, and and nature, but a hearty, honest transcript of all the author saw, felt, and enjoyed, in her wanderings. A warm, earnest, happy, hopeful human heart, beats audibly along its pages. She manifests, without any disguise, her quick, generous, womanly instincts, impulses, and enthusiasms—loves strongly, and hates deeply—despises shows and pretences, and looks through the guady pomp and tinsel splendors of religious despotism, to the wrongs and oppressions underlying them—and amidst all the seductive influences of life at Rome, retains her Protestantism and Democracy. Her representations of religious theatricals, and the way in which Christianity is caritatured and common sense outraged thereby, are very spirited and effective. Her contempt for mocklings is as hearty and emphatic as that of the stout German Reformer himself.

The book has the tone and coloring of a familiar letter; its careless *abandon* and unreserve only make it the more readable. Its faults lie on its surface, quite too manifest to offend any tolerable sport to the critical hunter after blemishes. We can readily forgive them, in view of the generous and freedom-loving spirit which pervades the volume, and which, we are sure, will commend it to the hearts of its readers. J. G. W.

A Day at the Crystal Palace, and How to Make the Most of It. By Wm. C. Richards, A. M. New York: Putnam & Co. For sale by R. Farnham, corner of Pa. avenue and 11th street, Washington, D. C. 1 vol., pp. 167.

This is an invaluable guide-book to visiters to the Palace. We regret we did not possess it at the time of our visit. It is just what we then felt the need of. †

Art and Industry, as represented in the Exhibition at the Crystal Palace, New York; showing the progress and state of the various useful and esthetic pursuits. By Horace Greeley. New York: Redfield. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Pa. avenue, Washington, D. C.

This is a valuable record of the Crystal Palace, beginning with its inception, to its completion; and under separate heads, judiciously classified, is a careful, clear, and succinct account given, of all that is beautiful in art or useful in life. And in the composition of these chapters there is a great amount of information of the choicest kind, on topics concerning which Mr. Greeley has been long accustomed to think and to write. It is a work to be studied and treasured up for future use. †

A Guide to English Composition; or, One Hundred and Twenty Subjects analysed and illustrated from analogy and the writings of celebrated ancient and modern authors, to teach the art of argumentation and the development of thought. By the Rev. Dr. Brewer. Boston: C. S. Francis & Co. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Pa. avenue, Washington, D. C. 1 vol., pp. 415.

We have no faith in any contrivances of teachers which will make the hill of science so easy that it will cease to be the strenuous and the earnest who alone shall reach the summit. But we find in this book much to admire and commend. It is by one of the masters of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, England, and its method is admirable, and if only used as a guide to begin with, until a boy shall—to use the schoolboy saying common in New England—"*get the hang of the school-us,*" it would do good service; but, (there must be *buts* everywhere, and oftenest in such matters as these,) the danger of saving labor and making a hard task easy, renders it questionable as to the ultimate results of this and like books. †

Helen Mulgrave, or Jesuit Executorship. 1 vol. Pp. 312. Published by De Witt & Davenport, Nassau street, New York. Sold by Gray & Ballantyne, Washington.

Seldom have we read a work of such absorbing interest, describing, as it does, the process by which a young inquiring mind is led to cast off the formula of the Catholic faith, in which it was trained, and the persecutions to which it is in consequence subjected, extending through every relation of life.

The book contains many truths of vital importance. G.

The Convent and the Manse. By Hyla. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleaveland: Jewett, Proctor, & Worthington. Sold by Gray & Ballantyne, Washington. 1 vol. Pp. 242.

We are here presented with a delightful picture of a clergyman's home—a home where intelligent industry presides, and governed by the sweet law of love; where the heart is free as mountain winds to gush forth in loving words and deeds, or in merry play with the happy spirits that surround it—a little heaven; *not* the heaven where no sorrow is, but where it comes as a ministering angel to turn the thoughts more trustingly upward, and make the tried and purified spirit beam with a more heavenly lustre. Perhaps the author is a clergyman's wife, and her own home sat for the portrait. If so, we envy its inmates, one and all—from the happy husband down to the Irish servant girl.

In strong contrast is presented the life of a convent, where the glad gushings of the heart of youth are represented as fettered by unnatural restrictions. The author arraigns those parents who, to gratify a selfish ambition, and gain political influence, send their daughters away from free and happy homes, where they have been tenderly reared by the hand of maternal love, and shut them up within gloomy walls, where, he says, they are subject to the artful persuasions and insidious teachings of Jesuits and Sisters, *miscalled* of Mercy. He holds, that forbidden to think, to judge, to act for themselves, it is impossible that their minds should be as thoroughly disciplined as in schools where free discussion and inquiry are encouraged; and hence that they the more readily receive the specious falsehoods and complicated dogmas taught them for truth. To *believe* and *obey* is their duty, and not to *reason* and *reflect.* Consequently, they soon learn to consider their parents heretics, and in the end fall into the arms of "Holy Mother Church." G.

THE FAMOUS CASE OF LORD STIRLING.

We understand that the Press is beginning to take notice of this important case. One more remarkable has rarely come before us; and never, we believe, have we heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by acts judicial and royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it could not openly violate the sanctity of the law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of compromising with him for his immense rights, by underhand means, to undo what it had vainly sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly commenced an illegal action against Lord Stirling by means of a treacherous agent; which action ought to have been dismissed at the onset, having been in open violation of the law and practice of the British courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadas, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1831, was such that the judges of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, for the *purpose of giving the impression* that the right had not been established.

To fully comprehend these points, those of our readers who are curious for details must consult the able work of Mr. J. L. Hayes, now about to be republished. Every man ought to read and understand it.

As, however, our subscribers may desire to have a few facts on the case, we will state some leading points; the more so, as agents of England have been remarkably active in falsifying the truth, and in all their attacks have carefully ignored the judgments in Lord Stirling's favor.

We shall divide what we have to say into two parts: the right of Lord Stirling to his title, and the right to his property. Of the first, we, in this country, care nothing. We, of course, in courtesy allow every man the name or distinction to which he is entitled in his own country. But in this case it is necessary to consider it, because it cannot well be separated from the fact of legal right to the property.

Lord Stirling took up his title in 1825, having been acknowledged and received according to Scotch forms by the assembled peers of Scotland, to whom his right was well known. He has ever since sat and voted with them. When the Crown of England began to be afraid of his establishing his right to the British Provinces, which had been granted by five charters to his ancestor, *and all confirmed by act of Parliament*, it opened an opposition in the Court of Session against his right to the Earldom of Stirling. The case was argued before the whole bench of thirteen judges, who (February 9, 1830) *unanimously* sustained his right. It subsequently came before the Lord Chancellor of England, who likewise recognised his right. It was likewise dragged on a quibble before the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, which on each occasion sustained the other judgments. It likewise was recognised by the King in Council, in August, 1831, in a most formal manner. And finally, when the illegal action, commenced in 1833, was brought into the House of Lords, it was finally admitted before that tribunal—the highest in Great Britain—and before which no man can present himself, bearing a name or character not recognised or established according to law.

Hence, on the point of *title*, there has not been an instance on record in Great Britain, of such repeated and unanimous recognition.

The reader, surprised, will perhaps ask, Why, then, this persevering opposition? The answer is simple enough; and we give it in the words used by many British Ministers—that "the claims involved political consequences of such moment, that the Government was afraid to grapple with them." This is the key to the whole mystery.

Now, as to the property. The Scotch law requires certain forms to be gone through, before an heir can enter into possession of his lands, and the rights appertaining to them. All these Lord Stirling fulfilled. He obtained *four* verdicts of Juries, of 15 men each—and finally, after the last or special Jury, the King, William IV, on a writ issued from Chancery, gave him, in the castle of Edinburgh, seisin or legal possession of all his lands and rights. These lands comprise the whole of the Canadas, Nova Scotia, &c., and the Fisheries. By that instrument of seisin, the charters confirmed by act of Parliament became again the law of those countries, giving the Provinces in fact, through Lord Stirling's rights, entirely independent of Government.

On the completion of that act, on the 8th of July, 1831, a great dinner was given to Lord Stirling, in Edinburgh, at which Mr. Robertson, advocate, who had been Chancellor of the last Jury, and is now Lord Robertson, Judge of the Court of Sessions, addressed the Earl in a complimentary speech, in which he remarked that "the law of Scotland had now done for him all that it could do to invest him with his rights," &c.

We must, at this point, say a few words in regard to Scotch Juries on questions of heirship. We have the testimony of many Judges to their superiority over the common Jury—and among them, Mr. Hayes gives that of a Judge singularly hostile to Lord Stirling, on account of the "political character," as he chose to term it, of his case. He quite ridiculed a common Jury, in comparison with the highly respectable Juries in Lord Stirling's case. The reason is obvious. The common Jury, from incapacity or want of habit, is rarely able to grasp the value of evidence, and takes its cue after the last speaker, or some obstinate fellow Juror; while in this system of Scotch Jury, men of a different stamp sit upon it. As for instance, in all Lord Stirling's Juries, the majority were Advocates, writers to the Signet, or Solicitors—the very men most capable of sifting documentary evidence; and through this severe ordeal did Lord Stirling go, *four times.* His case is the more strengthened, as in the case of the Title, by opposition; for on the latter Juries, in particular, lawyers presented themselves and sat on the Jury, who intended no favor to Lord Stirling, (the Crown lawyers watching the proceedings,) and yet they *unanimously concurred in the verdicts in his favor.*

To deceive the public on the importance of these verdicts, (as the character of these Juries is unknown out of Scotland,) the opponents of Lord Stirling have had recourse to falsehoods. For instance, some months ago, an *Englishman* imposed a statement upon the editors of the New York *Tribune*, which they accepted and repeated in good faith, to the effect that these Juries are assembled by the *macers* of the court, and before this "drunken tribunal" Lord Stirling went!

The reader will hear with surprise that the statement is a *pure invention.* Yet upon such "facts" has the whole slanderous opposition of agents of the British Government been based. Years before Lord Stirling came before the courts, the habit of employing *macers* to summon a Jury in the absence of a Judge, was abolished by act of Parliament; and all his Jury were assembled and acted under the improved and strict system instituted by the act of 1821. We have for obvious reasons enlarged upon this matter.

It was after "the law had done all it could do to invest Lord Stirling with his rights," that negotiations were opened with the British Government. They were chiefly characterized by shuffling and duplicity—their course was first interrupted by a forgery at the Colonial Office in London, the object of which was to get Lord Stirling to a place from which he could be carried away or kidnapped. The forgery was the act of the Private Secretary of the Colonial Minister, at the instigation of his chiefs. All these details, with letters and proofs, were published by the eminent London publishers, Ridgway & Co., and again in Edinburgh in 1835. Copies are in the Capitol Library, and in Mr. Peter Force's and other collections.

The agitation in the Canadas, and the acts of Lord Stirling in thwarting Government schemes in Parliament, were the cause of this project to extinguish him quietly.

It was immediately after this had failed, that, by gaining an agent of Lord Stirling, an illegal action, in May, 1833, was commenced against him, to *give the impression*, at home and abroad, that his case was not settled! The judges would not dismiss it. *They wanted to hold Lord Stirling's hands, while they plundered his lands and sought means to tranquillize the Canadas.*

In the mean time, a number of other documents came up, and a host of evidence and witnesses, to strengthen the case; and, finally, in 1837, a document was stolen from the Foreign Office in France, and sent to Lord Stirling, duly certified.

The officers of State in Scotland, on inquiry, received from Paris assurances of its genuineness; and one of them thereupon congratulated Lord Stirling's counsel upon it. But some of those gentlemen formed a plan for getting the office closed to further identification of the document, and proposed charging it as a forgery; trusting to their influence to get the present witnesses and other proofs out of the way!

The plan was carried out partially, and thus originated the pretended charge of forgery, of which Blackwood gave an entirely fictitious account, some three years ago. In point of fact, we have reason to believe this charge was merely got up to hide more effectually the real Colonial Office Forgery; for the document charged as a forgery by Lord Stirling, consisted of *seventeen lengthy writings*, all *in the handwritings of the parties who signed them.* If they had charged a mere forgery of signatures, that might have been possible; but here, a man was actually charged with a deed that was *physically impossible*, and which the united testimony of witnesses for and against Lord Stirling declared would have defied a whole academy! Besides, it was in a foreign language, and perfectly exact in the idioms and expressions of the time, &c. But what is final: Lord Stirling accidentally discovered documentary proof of its existence *fifty years ago;* and also an old English gentleman, who had seen it at that time.

In short, we do not know an instance of such reiterated outrages, as the whole illegal opposition to this established right has given rise to. The British Government, we understand, now indignantly denies that it had any hand in this bad business. But did it not wink at it? Was it really deceived by the Crown agents, who had an interest of some two or three hundred thousand dollars, to break up the case?

Lord Stirling not only established his case in law, but every opposition strengthened him. Why, then, persecute and ruin a man, because his rights are undeniable?

Now, in our view, this case involves two points of importance: 1st. As to the Fishery title, which affects us; and, 2d, as to the violation of law and solemn judgments in the person of an individual, which by every moral and human law affects all other individuals who have always rights to assert and maintain.

1. As to the Fishery question, it is clear, by the above-mentioned facts, that we have been treating with a party (the British Government) which for years has had no right or title to the Fishing grounds; the same having been solemnly conceded by an act of the British Sovereign, in the form of a royal act of seisin, issued out of Chancery in Scotland, on the 8th July, 1831, in consequence of the establishment of the right of Lord Stirling to the same by the laws of his country.

Such being the facts, are we doing right in continuing to treat with the British Government? Will any of our countrymen blame us for saying, that we are bound by every principle of honor to act justly, whether it be towards an individual or a nation; and that we think, since Providence has pointed out a way to repair the blunder committed by our statesmen in 1818, that we ought to take advantage of it? We consider it the more imperative so to do, because the method, thus pointed out to us, *is one perfectly legal*, and, we do not hesitate to say, *peaceful*, for restoring our ruined fishermen and our declining Fishing towns to that activity and prosperity to which they are so fully entitled.

2. As to the violation of law and judicial acts, in the person of an individual: every free man knows that it is the accumulation of individual wrongs that is the corrupt source of national wrong. If a right in the individual be injurious to the community, the same can and should be removed, but never without compensation. In this instance, the individual has repeatedly offered to accept of moderate compensation; but that has been withheld, simply because a few *other* individuals were envious and fearful of the immensity of the rights; and because Lord Stirling "obstinately" refused TO SHARE *with the underlings of the Crown*, who had made him repeated propositions.

In coming over to this country, and appealing to us, as an enlightened and liberal People, at the very moment most auspicious in the Fishery negotiation, we cannot believe that Lord Stirling will have reason to regret the step. He will find here more activity in supporting right and denouncing wrong. As a general rule, the "feet of the wicked are swift to evil;" while the well disposed rarely show either diligence, courage, or unanimity, in sustaining the persecuted. Here it is that the bold few trample upon, and, by their activity and united action, triumph over individuals; while the many, timid and careless, shrug their shoulders, sigh over the violation of rights and justice, or try to give credit to inconsistent falsehoods, if they do not even approve them by blaming the persecuted for a position from which they could by no possibility escape.

We have to say, in conclusion, that, in making this statement of Lord Stirling's position, we have done so from pure, disinterested motives. We have had the pleasure of his acquaintance and that of his family residing in Washington, and we can bear testimony to their perfect integrity and honorable bearing. We think the country ought to be supplied with the facts of the case. We therefore draw attention to them, because we have reasons for believing that there has been much activity displayed in preventing a consideration of the case by the country, through the agency of the Press. We have read all the attacks upon Lord Stirling and his rights; and we do not remember ever to have met with such an overwhelming refutation of calumny as that given by Mr. Hayes in his "Vindication."

To the wild assertions and slanders of the opposition, he has not only refuted them by the publication of the facts—*i. e.*, the acts royal, judicial, and official, the verdicts and judgments of courts, &c.—but he demonstrates upon irrefragable proof that crimes of the darkest character have been committed, for the purpose of destroying documentary evidence and obliterating official proofs upon which the case is based. †

☞ The Committee of the House of Representatives appointed to inquire "how far it is expedient for the public interest, and consistent with our civil institutions, to employ military men on our public works," consists of Messrs. Stanton, of Kentucky, chairman; Dawson, of Pennsylvania; Dickerson, of Massachusetts; Faulkner, of Virginia; Vansant, of Maryland; Sapp, of Ohio; and Keitt, of South Carolina.

Massachusetts on the Nebraska Bill.—The House of Representatives of this State yesterday passed the resolves in opposition to the Nebraska bill, by a vote of 246 yeas to 13 nays, eleven Democrats and two Whigs voting in the negative. So the spirit of justice and of freedom have not yet been "crushed out" of the freemon of this noble old Commonwealth!

The cotton factory at Memphis, Tennessee, was recently sold by the sheriff, for $35,000. It originally cost over $100,000.

For the National Era.

BELL SMITH ABROAD.

No. XIII.

FASHIONS AND FOLLIES.

Dear Friend: The last request made, before leaving home, came from numerous female friends, begging earnestly to send them the fashions—the latest wear. I have been very delinquent. To tell the truth, I am at a loss, and have been since my arrival, upon this important point. The French women are the best-dressed persons in the world, and being such, have no one pattern of an article which all exhibit, as with us. The fair and brunette, the tall and short, the slender and robust, cannot, save by miracle, find one garment suitable to all. Yet, at home, the attempt is made, and the unbending milliner deals out to each the one thing, casting every one who dare depart from it outside of good society. This is one of the mysteries of Parisian toilette that I have made some approach to a solution. The spirit, which adopts the becoming, gives a peculiar wear to the dress. Come with me upon the Boulevards, this sunny afternoon, and let us take Paris as it promenades. What a countless throng, and all on parade. If there is a single affair of importance in two miles of this stream of life, I am no judge of business. It is the hour for an exhibition, and let us take it in such spirit and notice. The stores have their contents in the windows; the idlers have their best upon their persons; and representatives are here from all parts of the world in competition, but without success. The Parisians are at home, and without equals. This English woman, with her thick shoes, costly furs, comfortable dress, and ruddy complexion, is a real daughter of John—has, doubtlessly, many acres, good health, and feels independent and above all creation—but she is not Parisian, all her money and influence cannot make her that. Here comes a pale, delicate, American girl—intellect in every feature, and unlimited wealth, too, at her command—yet all her ingenuity and imitation, sustained by unlimited resources, only make her a conspicuous failure. The very "bonne," in cap and gown, is something more than they. Look at this animated instance, as she walks gracefully along. What a complete picture. The dress is not a dress, but a grace born with her, and far beyond the touch of art. She owes nothing to the bonnet that is so small, and falls so far back that in front it appears only a cap; she owes nothing to the velvet cloak and rare furs, though she carries three thousand dollars on her shoulders and arms; she owes nothing to the well-fitting dress, so subdued yet so rich; nothing to the fair face even, to the delicate hand, to the well-turned ankle, and exquisite foot—those all may be given to another, and amount to nothing. It is the manner in which these are carried—are shown to the world; it is not dress, it is grace; not modest precisely, but spiritual. She comes and goes, a thing inimitable, unparalleled. She lifts her skirts to escape the soiled pavement in a way that would startle our home people—yet how well done. Crowds may jostle, carriages may splash, yet she glides along, untouched, unsoiled, a creature of grace, of beauty. She has not the dignity of the English woman, nor the modesty of an American—yet superior to both on the Boulevards, she has the talent for dress that makes up for the want of all else.

The great evil, with us, is the spirit of imitation. An American woman dare not dress becoming, for the fear of appearing odd. The Parisians have a way of holding their dress, not unbecoming precisely in them, because done with the talent. That manner will be important to the United States, and one and all will attempt the performance—awkward and unbecoming, to say the least, as it must appear. Yet, the "Bloomer" dress, a costume very well in its place, was hooted and laughed out of the country, because it did not originate in Paris. Now, I beg of you to remember, I am not "a strong-minded woman," but quite the contrary—something of a timid, weakly conservative—and the Bloomer dress I by no means think becoming; in it we lose the long sweep of drapery, so beautiful in our present dress; but, in the country, for fields and woods, riding, driving, or travelling, it is necessary to comfort and health. Yet, such are the wrongs of our humble imitation, that the very evils of Paris are unhesitatingly adopted. We wear improper dresses at evening parties; we dance improper figures in public assemblies, and suffer all kinds of uncomfortable ways, because we dare not be honest and independent.

We have the belief, prevalent at home, that gaudy colors in dress are peculiar to our country. This is not correct. The Parisians, on a bright day, resemble, if you can imagine such a thing, a garden of promenading sunflowers. The Boulevards have looked to me, at times, as if the merry owners had put in circulation their window curtains. Strangers, perhaps, do not notice this so much as with us, because Parisian women can carry anything so gracefully. Before we pull down the curtains and shape them into dresses, we must learn to walk; and to learn this art, we must walk. The shambling, rolling, duck-step—the hard, angular, upright, grenadier quick-step—the slow, the fast, the uncertain, may all be hid in carriages, or kept at home—but never cured, save by exercise, continual walking in the open air.

It is my duty to give you some information of the gayeties of Paris. But you must look to some other correspondent—I have neither health nor inclination. Save a few visits to the opera, and three dinner parties, I know nothing. The bal-masqué, once so famous that all strangers were expected at least to see one, have degenerated into such vile things that no one having the slightest self-respect ever wishes to witness the second. The most famous—I was tempted to write infamous—are at the Italian Opera House, and commences at midnight, Saturday. This makes it a Sunday orgie; and it continues on Sabbath morning until daylight. Our little party, one and all, declined witnessing such, until curiosity overcame their scruples, and they went, Dr. Bob protesting that it was a shocking affair—any other day it would not be so bad. D. answering, that Bob reminded him of the old lady in Virginia, who begged the gentlemen engaged in running the boundary line so to arrange it as to keep her house where it was, for "Caroliny was sich a sickly State"—D. thinking the evil to be in the ball, and not in the day.

I saw nothing of our friends until after a late breakfast, when they appeared, looking much ashamed of themselves, and were loud in their condemnation of the affair. They amused me with a little history of an elderly gentleman they were pleased to call "Ancient Jones." This individual had accompanied his only son to Paris, to see that his medical education should be thoroughly completed, and under his paternal care. I did not learn that the youthful Jones was disposed to break from the wise control of his careful father. But the old gentleman was full of fears—he heard of Paris as the city of evil, full of pitfalls and snares for youthful steps. One night not long since, the quiet, hopeful, said that his near and kind friend Brooks was very ill of the typhoid fever, and he wished to tender his services, and sit up the night by his friend. The father readily consented to this Christian conduct—and, as he permitted his boy to have no night key, left the door of their bedroom unlocked.

After his son's departure, however, he remembered that it was Saturday night—the night of the grand *bal-masqué* at the Italian Opera House, a thing he had heard much of, and had been solicited by his delicate boy to attend, merely to see, for once; but his morality, his sense of duty, recoiled; he sternly bade his son be silent on that vile subject. But, to tell the truth, the old gentleman had a lurking curiosity, and on this evening it became frightfully strong. What could possess him? He attempted his usual French studies, but Ollendorff seemed doubly stupid. One or two sentences in that valuable work took possession of his brain. "*Comptez vous aller au bal masqué ce soir?*" (Do you intend to go to the masque ball this evening?) "*Je compte y aller.*" (I intend to go) The opportunity was so favorable—he could go and return without his son's, without any one's, knowledge. His satanic majesty fairly took possession of the good old man; and he repaired to a neighboring store, where dresses were rented or sold, and selected the most appropriate—that of a friar of order gray—placed himself in a voiture, and in a few minutes was at his destination. He entered—the scene startled him beyond measure—the crushing roar of two hundred instruments, the dazzling light of chandeliers and jets, which seemed to go glittering up and up into a dizzy distance, lighting tier after tier, where thousands of eyes from behind black dominos reflected back the rays, as they looked down upon the myriads of fantastic forms which rolled and tossed under the sway of the deafening music, like a vexed sea by moonlight—made up a whole to dream of, not to see. Mr. Jones was startled, then shocked a little, very little amused, and finally, as I shall tell you, greatly alarmed. A strange fascination possessed him. After he had gratified his curiosity, he still lingered; he wandered on through the wild maze, and, as the hours wore on, the fun grew fast and furious—monks and knights jumped higher and higher—devils twisted—gypseys, flower-girls, dibardeurs, screamed as they fairly flew; while hideous beasts roared, howled, and squealed. The musicians seemed possessed, and rolled out without ceasing the wild strains, that seemed to madden every one. Mr. Jones was bewildered; many times was he seized upon by some fearful creature, and whirled through dances which made him dizzy and sick.

At last Mr. Jones was frightened—he was captured by a group, that, in a mad fit, seemed determined to torture him to death. He could not get away; one of the number, a girl, scandalously habited, seemed the leader. Her dress was very improper—her conduct disgusting. She was evidently intoxicated—smelled dreadfully of bad cigars and brandy. She would not let him go—called him, in excellent English, "her ancient garçon"—"a regular brick"—while the others laughed, shouted, and danced round him. At last he tore himself away, rushed home at daylight, tore off his gown, thrust it into the grate, and by its warmth hastened to bed, fearing every moment the arrival of his son.

Wearied to death, he soon fell into heavy sleep. When he awaked, he was conscious of some one being not only on the bed, but partially on him. He aroused himself—he looked—could he believe his eyes! there, on his bed, in his room at home, was that infamous female, sound asleep, with a cotton umbrella under her arm—worse and worse, the mask was off, and this female was his own innocent boy. He sprang from the bed, falling over and arousing some one, in the guise of a devil, asleep on the floor; another, a tall savage, was on the sofa—yet another, on the table; they were all round him. Did he dream? Was he yet at that infamous ball? Neither. His son, awakened, stared stupidly at him, and the sleepers, starting up, burst into a roar, as one of them exclaimed, "Why, Harry, Jim, here's the ancient garçon!" Mr. Jones happened to glance in the mirror—he had forgotten, in his haste, to remove his mask. These gentlemen had kindly brought his son home, and, being somewhat fatigued, had remained with him. The emotions of the elder and younger Jones I leave to your imagination.

Paris, January 19, 1854.

For the National Era.

IS SHE HAPPY?

BY MINNIE MYRTLE.

"What is fame to a heart yearning for affection, and finding it not? It is like the victor's wreath to him who is parched with fever, and longing for the one cooling draught—the cup of cold water."

This was the language of one who had been crowned with the laurel wreath of fame, and on whom was lavished all the world has to bestow of honor, and yet her heart hungered!

Is she happy? is a question I have often asked, concerning one who is walking in the same path, and breathing the same atmosphere of praise and adulation. I sometimes ask her if it is enough? if this is sufficient for her woman's heart? and she answers "yes." But I never yet believed her! Why those tears, when there is no visible cause? Why does she start, as if guilty, when suddenly roused from a revery? Why does she instantly assume that gay and careless air, lest we should know that she is ever sad?

I have seen her when she thought no eye was near, and no listening ear was by, with her face buried in her hands, and the hot tears falling thick and fast, while sobs seemed rending her bosom. If I should ask her then the cause of her weeping, she would answer, "nothing;" for woman must not speak the truth concerning her heart's yearnings.

And there are those who envy her—who think she glories in the world's homage, and loves its hollow praise. Oh, what an answer would her heart give back, could it speak from its hidden depths! Her name is on every tongue; but to her it is only mockery.

The unthinking world calls her cold and heartless—they contemptuously speak of her as one who prefers flattery to love—to whom the breath of fame is sweeter than the gushings of affection. She smiles, a gay, glad smile, when they tell her of the crown which is to deck her brow, and they think she will wear it proudly. They know not how her soul tramples it in the dust.

"Why does she not renounce that which gives her no pleasure?"

A literary man, in his advice to another, concerning the care of his health, says: "However happy he may be in the domestic circle, he must have something else to feed his *temper* and his *ambition!*"

"And is this also true of woman?" "No," I fearlessly answer, though there will be a multitude to contradict me. Woman needs nothing for her "temper" or her "ambition," if there is enough for her heart. God did not make man and woman equal and alike in all things—what a stupid world it would have been, if he had! "There are diversities of gifts." What is lacking in one, is made up in another.

But it *is* true that woman must have something to feed both her temper and ambition, unless her heart is full! The excitement of a literary life, or of any other which affords constant occupation, is not sufficient for the happiness of which she is capable—for which "her soul hungers;" but it preserves her elasticity and her usefulness; aye, and sometimes saves her from idiocy or from madness!

"Why has she never married? This is woman's sphere, and the duties of the household are woman's duties," is the stereotyped answer to all this. Yes, but they are duties which cannot be performed with any degree of acceptance when the heart is not engaged. Into other channels the heart may be forced, but into this never, as the thousand wretched homes into which woman has come with only her head and her hands abundantly prove.

"Is she happy?" No, not in the sense in which you put the question; but she is too true a woman to consent to make others miserable, by taking upon her vows which she can never fulfil—by consenting to preside over a HOME, while her heart is still wandering—by attempting to diffuse light and life into the fireside circle, when her own bosom is without the love, the warmth-giving element, which alone can link in harmony the family bonds.

Oh, how happy she would be, and how happy she could make others, surrounded by those in whom her affections delighted. How congenial to her would be those quiet duties and gentle offices which bless a home; "but there is a God in heaven who says thou mayest like to do this, but thou must do that."

When woman reigns in any other empire than home, it is from a stern necessity, which converts her into a martyr. But it is to the restless, weary ones of earth, that we look for the mighty deeds which shake the world and reform society. One who has spent his life in wandering says, "nothing is ever accomplished in the world by the happy;" yet there are some whose high sense of duty bids them relinquish the happiness they might enjoy, in order better to promote the good of others; yet there are many more who are *driven forth*, else they would never go.

Few, very few, women launch voluntarily on the sea where pleasure or safety depends on the breath of popular favor. It is with the hope of finding anchorage for the tempest-tossed bark—some rock which will give temporary repose—but it is far from being the beloved port. And let those who are in the midst of green fields and flowery vales envy them not their perilous resting-place.

For the National Era.

RECOLLECTIONS OF MY GRANDFATHER'S HOME.

CHAPTER III.

The Visit.

"We know not the future; the past we have felt;
Its cherished enjoyments the bosom can melt."

'Twas a happy day for Benny and myself when, released from the tasks and confinement of the school-room, we found ourselves on the road to our grandfather's farm. That day was an era in our young lives—the usher in of big plans for future usefulness. My grandfather was in the midst of haying, and needing help; the old market wagon had been dispatched for no less important personages than my brother, venerable by eight years, and myself his junior by one.

No reluctant tears then dimmed our eyes, as we bade the wonted good bye; and methinks our loved mother's customary injunction, "behave well, my dears," sounded less sweet than usual. "Dear," exclaimed little Benny, "I'm no dear! I'm a little man, my grandfather's man!" Dear, mentally repeated I, eyeing askance my pantalettes and checkered pinafore!

'Twas not the spirit which sends the schoolboy so prematurely from a round jacket into dress coat and dickey; or the lisping miss, from her mother's nursery, to wither in gas-lighted ball-rooms! Oh no; it was a self-importance, a first consciousness of our own individuality, gained with the newly conferred honor. Do you wish to plant self-reliance in the bosom of a child, to bind him to yourself by firm ties, make him, not your servant, but your useful companion in some pleasant employment. Let such work engage his busy hands; let him not feel it as a favor conferred on yourself, but that he does it because God gave him those hands to do the bidding of an unselfish heart. Thus, then, will spring up in the mind of that child a spirit of gentle benevolence, which shall make happy and honorable his after life.

Clumsily rattled the old market wagon beneath its juvenile burden, and wearily plodded the old gray horse, urged on by the blows from my grandfather's leathern whip. What cared we for equipage! No modish phaeton could have borne a happier burden. Our cheeks glowed with joy, not with shame; and each flourish of the leathern whip made our tiny fingers tingle with very gladness; for were we not going to be grandfather's help!

A true child never cares for fashion. Here and there an anomalous infant, who has been nursed in its breath, will lisp in mother tongue; but to the natural, free-hearted child, pleasure, not pomp, is the law of life. A few years bring wordly experience, and the guileless children change into selfish financiers and dancing fashion plates! Yet not always; for here and there beacon lights stand out, noble men and women who have not forgotten that they were made in the image of their Maker; men and women, who are not afraid to speak loudly in favor of honor and humanity! Aye, even in fashion's coterie we here and there find a noble soul above its trammels! God bless that man of the world, of humble but till then unknown parentage, whom I once beheld present to a brilliant circle his clever, old-fashioned mother, with her square neckerchief and small frilled cap! He had lived many years in the gay world, and was still a child!

The tops of the village chimneys fast receded from our back-turned gaze, and at length the shimmering of the weather-vane on the village spire was lost among the trees. We were literally in a strange country. The three mile plain, with its stinted pines and dwarf oaks, was as interminable, to our untutored imaginations, as the great desert; while a moderate-sized pond, Benny confidently whispered behind my grandfather's back, could be none other than the Dead Sea itself! Little Benny—he was innocent and simple then! With passing time went from me also this pleasant fancy—one more couplet lost from the poetry of childhood. How much of poetry, how much of romance, is dissipated by the garish light of maturer years! How much of simple faith and purity is put to flight by the cold conventionalities of life! Avaunt, proud Fashion! Let well up, now and then, in the dust and strife of busy life, the weighed-down glow and freshness of childhood.

The shadows had begun to lengthen on the neighboring hills, and the cow-bell was tinkling at the pasture bars, as we swung back the huge gate at the end of the green lane. My grandfather stood in the door, his gray hair covered by the identical slouched hat which had bravely weathered the storms of my birth-year. That same hat, weather-beaten and worn, has lain undisturbed for years in the corner of an oaken drawer, placed there by my grandfather's trembling hands.

"Fair weather, Moll," whispered Benny, as we simultaneously detected a roguish twinkle of his small gray eye, beneath their shaggy brows, and a significant elongation of the corners of his mouth. There was a more than usual trembling of the aged hand, and a gentleness of tone somewhat foreign to the speaker, as he bade us welcome. Benny and I were happy. What mattered it to us if our step-grandmother eyed askance the juvenile responsibilities devolved upon her—we were to be grandfather's help! His kindly greeting made our young hearts glow. O, speak gently to plastic childhood.

A light supper of bread and milk needed no digestatory exercise, and Benny and I were sent to bed, with the injunction to "be up bright and early for the haying." The sun was already making great red streaks across the blue and white counterpane, when Benny's little feet, pattering across the nicely-sanded floor in that veritable east chamber, startled me from an uneasy slumber. I was dreaming of that little enclosure in the mowing field. I thought we were gathering buttercups on Olley's grave, when a great pit suddenly opened, and little Benny fell into it! There was a slight choking sensation, and a mist around little Benny; but a snuff of the morning air, and the gush of a little robin under the window, restored my wonted cheer. How lightly shadows rest on the brow of childhood!

"Quick—we're almost ready," shouted Benny, at the top of his voice, and then ran away to help "fix off." No elaborate toilette retarded my exit that morning. Little Benny had pumped a basin of fresh water, which, with a napkin, awaited me, on the wooden bench at the back door. Never, amidst the appliances of luxury, have I laved my hands and face in a china basin with so much zest as I scrubbed them that morning in the wooden basin at the back door! When wearied by etiquette, worn out by the ceremonious nothings of now-a-day life, how are we fain to look back to the simple, time-saving, pain-saving customs of our ancestors! We find ourselves, in imagination, not in a modern social community, with its modern innovations, but in a circle where generalization is carried to a much higher point, and where property becomes personal, in the household, only by immediate possession. The days of mugs and ewerless basins have passed away—and, in good conscience, we must say, let them not come again!

"Breakfast"—who would stop for that; and, besides, some mysterious import attached itself to a huge, brown-paper bundle, under Nathan's arm—sundry grease spots in the stout envelope looked ominous. "I know; Hannah told me; cheese and gingerbread," said Benny, in an undertone. The keg with the leathern handle

was a riddle still. Benny turned it over. "Something that runs," said he, with a mysterious look. The olfactories proved the best expositors, and Benny raised his head, in great glee, all besmeared with molasses!

That forenoon's experience was long remembered, by one at least. Hat and sunbonnet were thrown aside; for Benny said he was a boy, and a browning would do no hurt—as for me, guileless then, what cared I whether I were black or white!

The smallest rakes were laid aside for the "new hands," as our grandfather jocosely called us; and the art of "raking after" soon ceased to be a mystery to us, novices. To be sure, our little hands were rather red and rather speckled; but, then, Benny said they would soon grow tough like Nathan's! (childish simplicity, that;) and the fun of treading down the sweet hay, and jolting over the sill of the barn, more than made up for all our ills.

"Our new hands aint so green, after all," remarked spruce young David to his fellow-mower. "Tell better arter the new's off," was the bluff reply! "The old clown," whispered Benny, indignantly. How clever David is, I mentally ejaculated.

Alas! Nathan's experience proved a better prophet, that day, than David's prepossessions. The big rock was an unsafe resting place for our tired little bodies. Benny was sure grandfather wouldn't care, and his sharp knife quickly severed the unyielding knot. No gourmand ever smacked his bit of turtle-fat with more gusto than the new hands gulped down Hannah's cheese and gingerbread that day. The keg proved more incorrigible; but Benny was a practical philosopher, and poised it nicely on a little stick. It was lubberly I who turned the scale. Just as the first dulcet drop reached my longing lips, an unlucky stone slipped, and down went I, with the round stick and brown keg!

"A sweet bundle you are—into the house, you little minx," shouted gruff, thirsty Nathan. Benny was indignant. "Touch her if you dare," retorted he, brandishing the aforesaid round stick in a most formidable manner. But there was no gainsaying the import of grandfather's lowered eyebrows, and we idled away a gloomy afternoon in the old farmhouse.

That night, when I had left Benny sobbing in his little bed-room, and found myself in the dark east chamber, somehow the furnishings of that room took on fantastic shapes; the curtains grew black, and waved to and fro; the oaken chest of drawers loomed into a great giant, while flitting forms seemed to rustle round me. I forgot to say my little prayer that night; and somehow I had, in the morning, a half-real, half-uncertain recollection of a frightful dream about a deep hole and little Benny.

The next day my grandfather seemed kinder than usual, old Nathan less gruff, and clever David handsomer than ever.

The two weeks passed quickly by. The brown envelope had become saturated; a new handle had been put to the little keg, and pay-day had come. Nathan and David deposited in their greasy, well-worn wallets their hard-earned gains; Benny and I each clasped in our brown hands a bright silver dollar! The old market wagon stood at the door; my grandfather's hand again trembled, and Benny declared there was a tear in his sharp, gray eye. Was there no anxious weight on his loving heart! whispered no messenger of ill omen in his ear!

The gate closed behind us, and in childish thoughtlessness we only looked back once, to see the rough sleeve drawn across the aged and tear-bedimmed eyes of our grandfather. Before the harvest lights had gone out, or the purple and gold had faded from the autumn forests, that gate opened again, very wide, to let in little Benny; the dim kitchen echoed once more to the tread of tiny feet and new voices; but the sounds were sad and low!

For the National Era.

GERMANY AND ENGLAND—NO. 3.

I trust you have borne in mind the general idea I started out with, to wit: a feeling of complaint at one-sided English reading, and attempts to make England alone the predecessor of our institutions.

I am sure, that to an experienced politician, as you are, it must have frequently occurred, that in all efforts for reform, this self-same one-sided English reading has been the main obstacle. It is the great barrier to law reform this day, as it was to Jefferson's strict construction doctrine, and as it was to Jackson's views on the currency, and to many other liberal views. Nay, let me ask you, very humbly, indeed, and without the slightest desire to offend, whether it has not been the stumbling block of a certain powerful party in the United States, that they hankered after English notions of Government? Where did they get their baneful class and special legislation?—where nine-tenths of their notions? Was it not, and is it not now, a most grievous political error, one that must lead us astray continually, to take it for granted that our Government sprung from the British, and that it is like it; and that, therefore, to understand ours, we must study theirs? I had supposed that eye-teeth had been cut enough by this time, to let the important truth spread beyond the Atlantic, that the United States Constitution must ever be viewed comparatively, but weighed abstractly. Its mother was Necessity, its cradle a New World, and its godfathers were men who looked beyond narrow national circles, and who, reasoning abstractly from the experiences of many nations, gave us a Government with few well-defined powers. They were misers in the storehouse of political power.

I have no wish to charge upon them that they copied from Germany the confederative idea, only I am sure they did not get it in England. I would but suggest, that it might be profitable to American statesmen, to read a little more of German history than they have been in the habit of doing, and I can but promise them that such a study will widen the circle of their thoughts, and that there they will find many knotty questions, which we have either passed over or which are yet to be settled, presented in somewhat familiar form, and likely to shed light upon the subject.

Why is it that nearly every German coming to the United States falls so easily into our form of Government? Why do they, with few exceptions, like it? Why are they, almost unanimously, States Rights men?

Why, on the other hand, does almost every Englishman, instinctively, dislike our form of Government? Why are nearly all our Governmental operations repugnant to his feelings?

These questions, pondered over without prejudice, must shed much light upon the issue I have presented. They are not put forth as mere invidious comparison.

I have presumed upon a former personal acquaintance with you, Mr. Editor—with whom to differ or to agree, politically, makes no break in friendly relations—to send you these suggestive views of mine. You will bear me witness, that I cannot be charged with neglecting English reading, and that I have not written the foregoing with a view to disparage or undervalue the services which many an Englishman has, in former and more recent times, rendered to the progress of rational freedom. I have always read, with pleasure, (and profit, I trust,) the standard English authors. But I must frankly admit that one great drawback herein has been, the ever-present self-laudatory assumption, that England is the paragon in Governmental progress—an assumption not warranted in truth. From such one-sided records, I love to return to the history of the nation within which has ever beat Europe's intelligent heart, and where liberty and national justice, and pre-eminently the latter, have been practical household words.

I may have given to the words of your correspondent a meaning he did not intend to convey. If so, I shall regret it. I shall follow his articles with due attention, and, following up the ideas I have suggested, may give, hereafter, a brief historical outline of the old Germanic institutions.

Much rather, however, would I see some abler pen than mine undertake this task; and to such a one I bespeak your readers' kind attention.

TUISKO.

IMPORTANT DECISION.—The United States Court, at Washington, has affirmed Judge Sprague's opinion, given in the Circuit Court, at Boston, in 1852, in which he decided that N. G. Norcross's Rotary Planing Machine does not infringe the Woodworth Machine.

Mr. Norcross resides in Lowell, Mass. The case was ably argued by Wm. Whiting, Esq., of Boston.

Charles P. Cooper, of Savannah, has abandoned the bar for the pulpit.

BEWARE OF COUNTERFEIT AND BOGUS NOTES.—Our friends cannot be too careful in selecting money to send us. For their guidance, we would state that no notes purporting to be issued in this city or Georgetown are considered good, or will be received by us, except the following: Bank of Washington, Bank of Metropolis, Patriotic Bank, and Exchange Bank of Selden, Withers, & Co., of this city; Bank of Commerce, Farmers and Mechanics' Bank, and Corporation of Georgetown, Georgetown, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1854

COUDERSPORT, PA., *Feb.* 16, 1854.

"Please let us know how your Daily is sustained. It is just what is wanted, and it *must be* permanently sustained. Surely, each of your voluntary agents for the Weekly will take at least one copy of the Daily; and I think a short appeal occasionally in the Weekly, would secure a large list. I cannot rest until the enterprise is made to pay."—*Extract of a letter from a Correspondent.*

One thousand more subscribers to the Daily, we said, last week, are necessary to save us from heavy loss. The facts are before our friends. We shall be most happy to receive subscriptions. They must not expect us, however, to bore them with many appeals.

TO OUR PHILADELPHIA SUBSCRIBERS.—Those of our subscribers in Philadelphia who have heretofore received their paper of Mr. W. Alcorn, are requested to leave their names and address with Mr. J. T. Bates, at his periodical stand near the Exchange, who will hereafter supply them with the paper.

Single copies of the Daily and Weekly may also be had of Mr. Bates.

BACK NUMBERS.—Having printed a very large edition of the present volume of the *Era*, we are still able to supply subscribers from the commencement of the same.

THE NORTH MOVING.

"Now's our time," said a Southern member of Congress; "don't let the Bill linger in the Senate, or it will be lost; give it to us at once, for if it be delayed, the Northern men will be frightened by their constituents."

"D—n them!" cried another; "a week more, and all is lost."

Keep cool, gentlemen. You have faith in the People, you know. Give them a chance to speak. At all events, you cannot gag them now. It is too late. The People understand what you are about, and you will soon understand what they are about. You can mystify them no longer. No sophistry will avail you. You cannot draw them off from the real issue, by a clamor about non-intervention, and the right of a people to regulate their own affairs. They all know what the Missouri Compromise means—that it has been regarded by a whole generation as a compact between the North and South, by which it was solemnly stipulated that Slavery should be forever prohibited in all the Territory of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min.—that this compact has never been disturbed or questioned, in any of the vicissitudes of the Slavery Question, in the bitterest controversies between the North and South; and they now know that Mr. Douglas, Mr. Cass, General Pierce, with other leaders of the so-called Democratic Party, without previous notice, without intimation in any quarter of dissatisfaction with this compact, without asking or waiting for any instructions on the subject from their constituents, are laboring to repeal it. They know that with this Compromise the Territory is forever secured to Freedom—that without it, it is open to Slavery. They know that this repeal is attempted just at a period when, by the recession of excitement following on the agitation of 1850, and by the general acquiescence in the legislation of that year, and by the machinery of National Conventions, pledging their respective parties to the settlement of 1850 as a finality on the Slavery Question, the North has been lulled into a state of profound security and apathy on the subject of Slavery.

Knowing all this, they feel outraged and insulted by this attempt of the Slavery Propagandists to take advantage of their want of organization and preparation.

Fortunately, the surprise has proved a failure. At first, the People of the North were perplexed, incredulous; they could not understand clearly the nature of the enormity contemplated; they could not believe that it was really intended. But doubt has been dissipated, and they are now aroused, we hope, to sleep no more. The papers at the North, and our own correspondence, teem with indications of a deep agitation, which short-sighted politicians had supposed impossible, so soon after the hot struggle of 1850.

A friend in Miami county, Ohio, sending us a large number of subscribers, remarks, that in a previous letter he had said, if Mr. Douglas continued "to press his wicked bill, he would send us still more subscribers." "The majority of these," he adds, "are Whigs and Democrats, and I shall obtain others soon. If the Bill pass, I can raise the list to forty, principally Whigs and Democrats. The movement is odious to every honest man that I have seen."

Meetings are announced all over the free States to denounce the Bill. Party differences are forgotten; Hunkers and Silver Grays are uniting with Free-Soilers, Liberal Whigs, and Democrats, in reprobation of the measure.

The great meeting at Chicago was sustained by the Old Line Democracy, supporters of Judge Douglas. A correspondent in that place, in a letter dated the 9th inst., writes to us—

"Last evening, our citizens assembled, *en masse*, at the South Market Hall, for the purpose of giving expression to their sentiments on the Nebraska question.

"The meeting was one of the largest and most enthusiastic ever held in this city. The call had been signed by about four hundred persons, nearly all of whom are prominent business men. As many thousand names could easily have been obtained, if the effort had been made, since *nearly every individual* to whom the call was presented, signed it without hesitation.

"The leading men in this demonstration, as will be seen from the newspaper reports of the meeting, were what are called Old Line Democrats. Those acquainted in this city will recognise, in the officers and speakers, many of the most prominent among the former supporters of Judge Douglas.

"The people assembled at this meeting were calm, but resolute, and exhibited a deep and settled feeling of indignation against the authors of this contemplated outrage upon the North, which I do not believe our Representatives and remaining Senator will feel at liberty to disregard. Herewith I send you a full report of the proceedings.

"P. S. Four of the five daily papers of this city have taken ground against the bill. The fifth, the Chicago *Democrat*, is as yet non-committal, but is expected daily to follow the example of the *Democratic Press*, which has formerly been a Douglas paper, but is strong in opposition of the bill!"

The Chicago *Tribune* says:

"The meeting at the City Hall, last night, will be an era, not soon to be forgotten, in the history of our city. It was not a meeting of Whigs or Abolitionists, to vent indignation at Senator Douglas. Three-fourths of the officers, from the chairman down, have always been known as Democrats, and the most prominent supporters of Senator Douglas, his personal friends and associates. James Curtiss, Chairman of the meeting, was several times elected Mayor of our city, and was never known to split a 'regular nomination.' Not less true to the party, and the 'Compromise Measures of 1850,' were Judges Dickey and Skinner, F. C. Sherman, and Daniel McIlroy, Esqrs., and other officers of the meeting. In all party matters, they have been *sans peur, sans reproche*. Of the Committee on Resolutions, all but two are Democrats, and only one was opposed to the 'Compromise Measures.' Indeed, the whole meeting was truly a Democratic demonstration, though mere *party* had nothing to do with it, as was evidenced by the fact that the speakers were promiscuously drawn from *all* parties."

The *Hartford* (Conn.) *Republican* believes that the *New Haven Register* is the only paper in the State of Connecticut that advocates the bill. We have already quoted from the *Hartford Times*, the leading organ of the Old Line Democracy of the State, extracts condemning the measure in the strongest terms. The *Republican* says—"We know that if any Representative of Connecticut in Congress vote for the bill, he will kill himself politically."

The *Buffalo* (N. Y.) *Republic*, an Administration paper, says—

"The consummation of these unhallowed schemes will mark a new era in the history of the Slavery agitation in this country, which will assuredly result in the political annihilation of every Northern doughface, and provoke such a strong popular indignation as will most effectually set at rest all schemes calculated to extend and perpetuate Slavery on this Continent. Let these puissant agitators proceed in their traitorous and disorganizing schemes."

We have already stated that the German press generally is hostile to the measure. We observe with pleasure that *Le Republicain*, of New York, a journal circulated among citizens and residents speaking the French language, is denouncing the bill in the severest language. Hitherto, we are informed, this paper has been in the habit of lauding Mr. Douglas as a Man of Progress, but its stomach is turned by this last demonstration. It can find no terms too harsh to apply to the bill and its author.

Resolutions against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise have been introduced into the Assembly of Wisconsin, and referred to a committee favorable to their object. The Milwaukie *Daily Free Democrat* notes but two papers that have come out in support of the bill of Judge Douglas, and the comments of these are confined to the first bill, which has been substituted by another and a different one.

The counties in Wilmot's district are moving, as already announced. Meetings are advertised at various points.

A spirited call is published in the Wellsborough (Tioga county) *Advertiser*, signed by a number of the most prominent Democrats of that place.

Judge Wilmot, by invitation, attended a meeting of the Democracy of Susquehanna county, on the 23d ult., called to send Delegates to the Harrisburgh Convention. He made a speech on the occasion, in which he told them "that, in his past political course upon the Slavery question, he had nothing to regret—he had acted honestly—was as much opposed to the extension of that curse of humanity and the country, as ever—denounced Douglas and his Nebraska Bill in unmeasured terms, saying that if this bill was not nipped in the bud, he would resign his present office and take the field, and agitate the subject, which the men who are so anxious to avoid agitation are continually thrusting in our faces. Strange to say, he was received with loud cheers, by a large part of the audience, whose sympathies are on the side of freedom, but who are whipped into the ranks of party by party leaders. Yet, on this occasion, they showed decided symptoms of rebellion."

The Christian community at the North is as deeply moved as the Political. The tone of the Religious press may be inferred from the following paragraph, from a long editorial in the Hartford (Connecticut) *Religious Herald*, of the 9th inst.:

"Truly, if Congress can be induced to sanction such a scheme, and the People do not thereupon revolutionize the Government, we can scarcely conceive of any measure so corrupt in nature, or so fatal in tendency, that it could not secure the assent of our nation. And do we call ourselves a Christian people? Have we a Church of Christ in the land? What is our religion worth, when it has no power to prevent the very church members from rushing to the support of such flagrant wickedness? We call, then, upon every Christian patriot to use his influence against the consummation of this perfidy. A remonstrance against it, intended for general signature and to be forwarded to Congress, will be found at this office. Let similar ones be everywhere circulated, and public meetings be called, to express the true sentiment at the North."

The St. Louis (Mo.) *Evening News* denounces the Bill of Judge Douglas. "Instead," it says, "of ignoring the Missouri Compromise of 1820, as his first bill proposed, or making it inoperative, as his last modification declares, he should have brought in a plan for the organization of Nebraska, framed with an eye to the fact that such a Compromise existed as a law of the land, the making of which tasked the mightiest talents and the purest patriotism of America."

The *News* asks: "Even admitting, for the sake of the argument, that the Compromise of 1820 is not in strict accordance with the letter of the Constitution, is not an acquiescence of thirty-three years in the measure sufficient to entitle it to stand as a part of our *unwritten* Constitution?"

"The purchase of Florida is an act that has always been seriously questioned; but is there to be found a man who would have that act repealed, and the Territory acquired thereby ceded back?"

"The Missouri Compromise does not rest on a principle of abstract constitutionality: it is a solemn compact entered into between the North and South, which each party is bound, by every principle of honor and fairness, to preserve intact."

The path of duty is plain. The issue is, the *repeal of the Missouri Compromise*. Mr. Douglas, General Cass, and the Administration, with several Northern Democratic Senators, are committed to the scheme. They cannot draw back. At one time, they were sure of commanding a majority for the measure. Had a vote been then taken, their hopes would in all probability have been fulfilled. The aspect of things has changed. They are now full of apprehension. Every day, their position becomes more and more critical. Party is strong, Patronage is strong, the Slave Interest, which wields both for its own purposes, is here overbearing—but, the Northern People, fully aroused, are mightier than all. Let the Press thunder in the ears of Congress. Let public meetings everywhere be held, let the written reports of proceedings, and properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the Senate of the United States for presentation.

The danger still impends. Let not the People become supine under the impression that the measure cannot pass. The slaveholders calculate in the House upon a united Southern vote, upon the body of the Democratic delegates from Pennsylvania—the Issachar of Slavery—and upon enough scattering recruits from New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin, to force the measure through that branch. We should fear the result of a vote to-day; but every hour's delay weakens the ranks of the Propagandists, and ultimate defeat awaits them if the People of the North *be true to themselves, and prompt*. Let every meeting take care that its proceedings be brought to the notice of the member representing the district in which it is held. Let every press that opposes the scheme take care that its articles come under the eye of Congress. Every effort is made here to misrepresent the state of feeling at the North; let the Northern Constituency speak directly to the ears of Congress.

We are deeply moved in this matter. All our thoughts are absorbed by it—all other political questions sink now into insignificance. Let the People triumph this time, and the Slave Power receives a blow from which it can never recover. Let the Slave Power triumph, and Revolution itself may become necessary to stay its desolating march.

"THE ORIGINAL" POLICY.

"Was not the policy of the fathers of the Republic," asks the *Sentinel*, "made to declare in the most emphatic manner possible, that Slavery *should* be 'secured outside the State limits;' and that whithersoever Slavery should flee, the ubiquitous arm of the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government' alone secures this Slavery, and holds it Slavery, not only where it has exclusive jurisdiction, but in the very heart of free soil and Free-Soilers, where in fact the *only* jurisdiction, almost, which the General Government possesses, is the jurisdiction to hold a slave still a slave, and all the retained sovereignity of a State, peopled exclusively with Free-Soilers, has to acknowledge the rightful jurisdiction of the General Government to take and restore the fugitive? In truth, it may be clearly stated that the whole power of 'the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government' is not only authorized, but pledged to exert it, not only where its power is exclusive, but where it is restricted and limited by all the retained sovereignty of States; that, in fact, to whomever Slavery attaches, no power on earth, in its own State, in other States, in the National domain, or upon the seas, shall loosen that bond, except by the action of the bondholder himself."

This is the last consideration urged by the *Sentinel* against the position, that the original policy of the Government was to restrict Slavery within State limits, and secure freedom within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government. Here, as throughout the argument, the *Sentinel* relies upon mere exceptions, to overturn a general truth. We have never claimed that the Anti-Slavery views of the fathers of the Republic were *fully* embodied in the Government they founded; that they were not at times constrained, by circumstances appearing to them imperative to qualify them to a certain extent; that the Federal Constitution contains not a single provision repugnant to those views. The ground we take is, that, by the policy of the framers of the Federal Constitution, Freedom was regarded, protected, and provided for, as a National, Normal, Permanent Interest—Slavery, as Sectional, Exceptional, and Temporary.

A few years before, when organizing the Confederation and declaring its independence of Great Britain, they rested the vindication of their act upon a solemn affirmation of the doctrine that "all men are created equal, with certain unalienable rights," among which "are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" that to protect these rights Governments are instituted; that when a Government fails in this duty, and habitually tramples upon them, it is the right of the People to amend or substitute it; that the British Government had been guilty in both respects, and therefore, the Colonies were justified in rejecting it, and forming a Government for themselves. The sole ground of their justification was, the *doctrine of the natural equality of rights among men*. This being admitted, the vindication of their act was triumphant; if untrue, the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of our distinct existence as a Sovereign People, is simply a lie. Our fathers believed it true, and it was this Principle that controlled their action when they came to found the Constitution of the United States; for in behalf of the People of the United States they solemnly declared that their intention in framing the Constitution was to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and posterity. Now, it will be found that all the main provisions of this instrument are manifestly designed and calculated to protect personal liberty, to secure fundamental rights, to restrain the ambition of majorities, to preserve the essential rights of the individual States, to check the tendency of power from the many to the few. Its pervading spirit is, respect for the Principle of Natural and Equal Rights among men.

Three provisions, evidently exceptional in their nature, point to the existence of an Element in the Union in conflict with this Principle: these are, the arrangement in regard to the representative ratio, the clause relating to the migration or importation of persons prior to the year 1808, and the stipulation in regard to fugitives from service or labor. We, who have been born and educated in this country, understand that these provisions have been uniformly applied to Slavery; but a foreigner, unacquainted with our social condition and history, could never infer this from the provisions themselves, or from any other portion of the Constitution. The language in which they are clothed is ambiguous; the words, "slave" and "Slavery," are never used; the very *idea* is rejected. Why? Because the framers of the Constitution felt that Slavery was repugnant to the truths of the Declaration of Independence, repugnant to the spirit and intention of the Constitution they were forming, not fit to be named among the institutions of a Democratic Republic. That is not all—the provisions were so framed, that this exceptional institution might cease to exist, without the necessity of preliminary change in them. Besides, every implication is carefully excluded from them, which might favor or tolerate Slavery as right or proper. They proceed on the assumption that it *exists*, but not that it is good or just. They make certain arrangements in view of its existence, deemed necessary to prevent the General Government, about to be established, from coming into collision with sectional interests identified with it, but afford no encouragement to it, and no inducement to its continued existence.

"Line upon line, precept upon precept," is a necessity. We are wearied with iterating and reiterating, but the perpetual repetition of error and sophistry imposes the wearisome task upon us.

The three provisions alluded to are these:

1. "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be embraced within this Union, according to their respective number, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three-fifths of all other persons*."—*Art.* 1, *sec.* 2, *Con. U. S.*

2. "The migration or importation of *such persons* as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars a head."—*Con. U. S., art.* 1, *sec.* 9.

3. "No *person* held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—*Con. U. S., art.* 4, *sec.* 11.

The first provision, as Americans understand it, recognises the *existence* of Slavery as a fact, but certainly gives no countenance to it. On the contrary, it makes it a ground and reason for reducing the representative power of the communities upholding it, so that it is in fact a positive discouragement to Slavery.

The second provision, as we have already explained, secured for the General Government power to put an end to the slave traffic in 1808, a real gain to Freedom and Humanity, as before the adoption of this it had no power over the subject whatsoever. The securing this power was a triumph of the Anti-Slavery Principle of our fathers; the postponement of its exercise till 1808, was the result of circumstances, as they thought, beyond their control.

The third clause certainly does not apply in terms to slaves; it does embrace, we all know, the case of free persons, held to service or labor, as apprentices. Were a court, in its administration of a law passed in strict conformity to this provision, to confine itself to its terms, no slave could be delivered up under it, because no slave *owes* or *can owe* service. The slave renders service to his master, not because it is "due," in the language of the Constitution, but because he is compelled by force to render it. We know only by history that the provision was *intended* by those who introduced it to apply to both fugitive slaves and apprentices; but from the same history we learn that it was introduced incidentally, attracted little attention, and was adopted without careful examination of its bearings or probable consequences; that the object of it was to prevent the owners of slaves in the States from sustaining loss by their escape, but that no one dreamed that it sanctioned Slavery, encouraged it, or would perpetuate it.

The *Sentinel* dwells upon this clause of the Constitution with great complacency, assuming that it establishes Slavery throughout the Union, and surrounds it everywhere with the sanction and support of the General Government. Where is its authority for the assumption? If it confine itself to the provision alone, to the only *legitimate* construction, its terms suggest and the general spirit and aim of the Federal Constitution warrant, then we say that provision is not applicable to slaves at all. If it refer to History, and the Madison Papers containing an account of the proceedings of the Federal Convention that adopted it, for the purpose of showing that it was *intended* to embrace the case of fugitive slaves, then it must not go beyond History and that record. But, if it appeal to them, then it must admit, that public sentiment in the colonies, when they embarked in the war of Independence, was against Slavery; that after the Declaration of Independence, State after State, by judicial decision or legislative enactment, recognised the policy of emancipation; that in the last Congress of the Confederation, sitting at the same time the Convention that formed our present Constitution was in session, the famous Ordinance of 1787 was passed, excluding Slavery forever from the Territory Northwest of the Ohio river—*the only Territory then belonging to the United States*; that this act was not the offspring of any purpose to draw a line between slave territory and free, but of the policy then dictated by public sentiment, of *limiting Slavery*; that in the Convention that formed the present Constitution, Slavery was uniformly treated as an exceptional and transient system, to be tolerated as a necessary evil, for the time, while every provision in relation to it was so framed as to avoid mentioning its name, or recognising its fundamental principle, so that it might at any time be abolished in the States without the slightest change being required in the Federal Constitution; that the delegates from Virginia and Maryland were the most strenuous against the insertion of any provision that might encourage the perpetuation or extension of the evil; that an amendment having been proposed which seemed to involve the recognition of the idea that man could hold man as property, it was modified so as to exclude this idea, at the suggestion of Mr. Madison, who insisted that the Constitution they were forming ought not to contain any implication that man could be property; that the abolition of the slave trade in those days was regarded as involving the abolition of Slavery; that the clause conferring power in Congress to prohibit the slave trade in 1808, was adopted with a view to facilitate and hasten the extinction of Slavery; and that the provision in regard to fugitives from service or labor was not intended even by the South Carolina delegates, who suggested it, to give encouragement or sanction to Slavery, to establish it under the jurisdiction of the General Government, to nationalize it, but merely as a stipulation between the States, securing the slaveholder against pecuniary loss through the occasional escape of his slaves, and that it was agreed to with scarcely any discussion or examination, in a Convention the great majority of the members of which acted, whenever the subject of Slavery was referred to, under the full persuasion that, as it was a temporary institution, whatsoever arrangements might be made respecting it, would of course be temporary, and not vitiate the essential character of the Constitution they were forming.

The *Sentinel* may then take its choice. If it confine itself to the letter of the clause, there is no Slavery in it; if it go to History and the Record for the interpretation, it must stand upon our ground and come to our conclusion.

As confirming our views, as illustrating the intention of those who framed the Federal Constitution, and the opinions of Madison, a recognised authority with Southern statesmen, and as incidental though forcible testimony to the soundness of the position assailed by the *Sentinel*, we shall close this article by quoting freely from a debate which sprung up on the subject of the slave trade, in the first Congress under the Constitution.

The tariff bill having been reported in the House, in May, 1789, Mr. Parker, of Virginia, moved to insert a clause imposing a duty of ten dollars on every slave imported. He was sorry that Congress had not the power to stop the importation altogether. "It was *contrary to revolutionary principles*, and ought not to be permitted." Smith, of South Carolina, with characteristic jealousy of Federal interposition, opposed the motion. Sherman, of Connecticut, favored the object of the motion, but did not think it a fit subject to be embraced in the bill. "He could not reconcile himself to the insertion of *human beings, as a subject of impost, among goods, wares, and merchandise*." He hoped the motion would be withdrawn for the present, and taken up afterwards as an independent subject.

Jackson, of Georgia, opposed the motion, charged Virginia with selfishness in her labors to suppress the slave trade, hoped the gentleman would withdraw his motion, and that, should it be brought forward again, "it might comprehend the white slaves (as well as the black) imported from all the jails of Europe."

Parker persisted in his motion. "He hoped Congress would do all in their power to restore to *human nature its inherent privileges*; to wipe off, if possible, the stigma under which America labored; to do away the *inconsistency of our principles*, justly charged upon us; and to show, by our actions, the *pure beneficence of the doctrines held out to the world in our Declaration of Independence*."

Ames, of Massachusetts, "detested Slavery from his soul; but he had some doubts whether imposing a duty on their importation would not have an appearance of countenancing the practice."

At this juncture, Mr. Madison, who had taken a leading part in the construction of the Constitution, came to the support of the motion of his colleague in a powerful speech. Read some extracts from it, and say, whether the illustrious Virginia statesman, a fair representative at that time of the "fathers of the Republic," regarded Slaves or Slavery as the *Sentinel* and its associates now do, or, rather, whether his views do not confirm those presented in the *Era*:

"The confounding men with merchandise," he said, "might be easily avoided, by altering the title of the bill; it was in fact the very object of the motion, to *prevent* men, so far as the power of *Congress extended, from being confounded with merchandise*. The clause in the Constitution allowing a tax to be imposed, though the traffic could not be *prohibited* for twenty years, was inserted, he believed, *for the very purpose of enabling Congress to give some testimony of the sense of America with respect to the African trade.*

"By expressing a *national disapprobation of the trade*, it is to be hoped we may *destroy it*, and so save ourselves *from reproaches* and *our posterity from the imbecility ever attendent on a country filled with slaves.*

"This was as much the interest of South Carolina and Georgia as any other States. Every addition they received to their number of slaves, tended to weakness, and rendered them less capable of self-defence. In case of hostilities with foreign nations, their slave population would be a means, not of repelling, but inviting attack. It was the duty of the General Government to protect every part of the Union against dangers, as well internal as external.

"Everything, therefore, that tended to increase this danger, though it might be a local affair, yet if it involved national expense or safety, became of concern to every part of the Union, and a proper subject for the consideration of those charged with the general administration of the Government."

Bland, of Virginia, was no less decided in his support of the motion.

Burke suggested that, if not particularly named, slaves would still fall under the general five per cent. ad valorem duty on all unenumerated articles.

"Madison replied, that no collector of the customs would presume to apply the terms goods, wares, and merchandise, to persons; and in this he was supported by Sherman, who denied that persons were recognised anywhere in the Constitution as property. He thought that the clause in the Constitution on which the present motion was founded applied as much to other persons as to slaves, and that there were other persons to whom it ought to be applied, as convicts, for instance; but the whole subject ought to be taken up by itself. Finally, upon Madison's suggestion, Parker consented to withdraw his motion, with the understanding that a separate bill should be brought in."

In the face of such authority as this, the Pro-Slavery men in our day talk flippantly of slaves being regarded as "*property*," as "*merchandise*," as "chattels," by the Constitution; and the *Sentinel* coolly declares that "our forefathers" "gave their sanction to widen the basis of Slavery by extending the period of the slave trade, and made diligent use of that extension of time to reap a rich harvest," when, as a matter of fact, all the States but Georgia had prohibited the trade in 1789, and all the States, without exception, in 1798.

Enough for this time.

THE ISSUE.

The *Washington Sentinel* quotes the following paragraph from the Address of the Independent Democratic members of Congress, as defining the precise ground of opposition to the Nebraska Bill in its present form:

"We believe no permanent adjustment of that question possible, except by a return to that original policy of the fathers of the Republic, by which Slavery was restricted within State limits, and Freedom, *without exception or limitation, was to be secured to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government.*"

This paragraph may be considered, first, as asserting a *fact*—that it was the original policy of the fathers of the Republic, that "Slavery should be restricted *within State limits*, and Freedom be secured to every person *outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government.*"

The *Sentinel* denies this, and attempts to disprove it by several considerations. We congratulate that journal upon its attempt to argue the real issue between the Pro-Slavery and Anti-Slavery men. True, its logic is not compact, and its argument is verbose and declamatory; but as it means to be argumentative, it deserves some attention.

In disproof of the assertion in the Address, it refers to the provisions of the Constitution in relation to the foreign slave trade, and to fugitives from service or labor, and the existence of Slavery among the Indian tribes.

"Does the assertion of the Address," it asks, "find countenance and support in the fact, that 'the fathers of the Republic' made the most careful provision to secure Slavery 'outside State limits,' by giving their sanction, countenance, and the national protection, to those ancestors of the present Free Soil party *to make Slavery* 'outside State limits,' and to bring them in these 'State limits' as slaves? The national flag, carrying with it 'the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' waved its folds with sure protection over the decks of those vessels in which were those fathers from whose loins sprang the present Free Soil party, in their work of charity, in buying, capturing, and transporting slaves, from without 'State limits,' acting, according to the denunciations of their Free Soil children, 'the pimps and panders' to the more judicious slaveholder at home. The national flag, emblazoned with 'the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' 'secured Slavery, without exception or limitation,' to every negro 'outside of State limits,' who should fall into the hands of these 'ancestral pimps and panders' to the home purchasers of slaves. This was the 'policy of the fathers of the Republic,' as it was the 'practice' of the fathers of the Free Soil party."

Aside from the flummery of this paragraph, the point of the argument is this—that the foreign slave trade was sanctioned, countenanced, and protected, by the Federal Government, from the organization of the Constitution down to the year 1808—*therefore* it was not the policy of the fathers of the Republic to secure Freedom to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government. A simple statement of facts will show the fallacy of this.

Under the Congress of the Confederation, the States had the power to regulate their trade with foreign nations. They levied imposts or duties, just as they pleased, provided they did not interfere "with any stipulation of treaties, entered into by Congress with any King, Prince, or State, in pursuance of any treaties already proposed by Congress to the Courts of France and Spain;" and the United States were prohibited from any act or treaty "whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts or duties on foreigners as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or merchandise whatsoever." They might tolerate or forbid the trade in slaves; allow or prohibit the migration or importation of any class of persons from abroad, at their pleasure.

In the Convention that framed the present Constitution, the power to regulate trade with foreign nations, after much deliberation, was transferred from the States to the United States; and it was the strong desire of the majority of the delegates, including those from Virginia and Maryland, to surrender to the United States the entire power over the migration or importation of persons from abroad. This was strenuously resisted by South Carolina and Georgia, until at last a Compromise was proposed, which was sustained by delegates from the Eastern States, investing Congress with the power to pass navigation laws by a simple majority, and with the power to prohibit, in the year 1808, the migration or importation of such persons as the original States might think proper to admit prior to that time, and meanwhile to impose a tax on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars a head.

Before the adoption of the Federal Contitution, then, the United States had *no power* over the Slave trade. *By* the adoption of the Constitution, after a hard struggle, springing from the jealousy of South Carolina of the Federal power, the United States were invested with the authority to prohibit that trade in the year 1808, and to discourage it before that period. As a matter of fact, the power to discourage it was exercised the moment the new Government went into operation; by the year 1798, all the States had laws in force prohibiting the trade absolutely, and an act of Congress imposed the severest penalties for the infraction of those laws; and in 1808, so soon as the Constitution allowed, the United States enacted their famous law for the total suppression of the traffic.

This brief history demonstrates that it was not the policy "of the fathers of the republic" to "give their sanction, countenance, and the national protection" to the slave trade. The *Sentinel* misrepresents the truth of history, and grossly libels their character. They secured by the Federal Constitution a power for Congress, to abolish the slave traffic, which it had never before possessed; and that this power could not be exercised till the year 1808, was the result of circumstances which they could not control, and proves nothing against the truth of the declaration of the Address, that their original policy was to secure freedom to every person "outside of State limits and within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government."

(Be it remembered here, that slaves imported into the State, prior to the year 1808, were not "*within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.*")

The *Sentinel* follows up its fallacious statement, with an assertion, which we are glad to see made so boldly, as follows:

"And now, if a cargo of these 'chattels' be shipped at a port within State limits, and the 'floating territory' upon which they stand moves to the ocean, 'outside of State limits,' and bearing the flag, the evidence of the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' they continue chattels, *solely and exclusively* by virtue of that very 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government,' which this Free Soil party alleges 'secures freedom' emphatically. In both the former cases, it is the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government' *alone*, which *secures slavery on board* this 'floating territory.'"

Mark—the *Sentinel* speaks of slaves as if they were named and treated in the Federal Constitution as chattels, or subjects of merchandise. He has no authority for this. Slaves are never mentioned or regarded in the Constitution as property. No provision in relation to them implies that they are property. There is not a word in that instrument which can be tortured into giving countenance to such an idea. If there be, produce it. Give us the article, the section, the clause. Stop your declamation, and submit the proof of your assumption. Repeatedly have the pro-slavery men been challenged on this point, but never have they responded. We defy the *Sentinel* to quote a single clause of the Federal Constitution authorizing it to regard or name slaves as chattels or property, when discussing their relations to the Federal Government.

But, let us examine its bold averment. It is, that "slaves shipped at a port within State limits," and carried in an American vessel out upon the ocean, "outside of State limits," are not held as chattels *in virtue of any State law*, but only "*in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government.*"

We thank the *Sentinel* for the important admission it makes. It involves a principle, fundamental in the creed of Independent Democracy—a principle of Natural Law, recognised and respected in the Constitution of the United States. That Principle is, that Slavery, being against Natural Right, exists only as the creature of force, embodied in or recognised by positive statute, which has no operation beyond the jurisdiction of the Legislature enacting it. On this Principle, a slave escaping from one sovereign nation into another, is exempt from reclamation. An attempt to seize him and carry him back to the place whence he fled, would be not only an outrage on his right, but an affront to the sovereignty of the nation in which he has found refuge.

On this Principle a slave escaping from Virginia into New York would be secure against reclamation and seizure, but for a positive stipulation in the Federal Constitution in relation to fugitives from service or labor. On this Principle, a slave carried by his master from Kentucky into Ohio, or permitted by him to go there, cannot be reclaimed or seized as a slave, the said stipulation being confined expressly to persons *escaping from service in one State into another*, where such service is not recognised—and not embracing persons held to service in one State, and placed by the voluntary act of their masters in another. On this Principle, slaves shipped at Norfolk, Virginia, carried in an American vessel, on the ocean, outside of State limits, by the voluntary act of their masters, cease to be slaves, because, as the *Sentinel* admits, State jurisdiction does not extend beyond State limits—the laws of Virginia have no extra-territorial force.

But, at this point, the *Sentinel* meets us with the assertion, that such slaves, the moment they are carried "outside of State limits," are held as "chattels," in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government—"it is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government *alone* which *secures Slavery* on board this floating territory."

Has the *Sentinel* analyzed the bearings of this assumption? Is it willing to abide by its consequences, admitting for the sake of argument that it is true? If it be true, what becomes of the *Sentinel's* favorite policy of Non-Intervention by Congress in relation to Slavery? The General Government is a slaveholder—the People of the United States, whose agent it is, are slaveholders. The General Government and the People of the free States are habitually guilty of Intervention in regard to Slavery, which the *Sentinel* and its pro-Slavery associates insist should be entirely withdrawn from Federal action! This is not all. If the General Government can intervene in behalf of Slavery, it can intervene against it. If intervention by the General Government *alone* secures Slavery on board of American vessels, carrying slaves on the high seas from one slaveholding port to another, then, if withdrawn, Slavery ceases, and the slaves are free; and that it ought to be withdrawn, the advocates of the policy of Non-Intervention are bound to admit. If they will not do this, if they will insist that the Federal Government should continue that Intervention, by which alone Slavery is secured in American vessels on the high seas, with what consistency or decency can they denounce as unconstitutional the policy of Intervention by the Government, when it is directed to prohibit Slavery on land belonging to the United States?

The question arises, Is the assumption true? The only provision in the Constitution of the United States which has ever been claimed to apply to slaves "outside of State limits," is the clause relating to fugitives from service or labor. This applies, as we have said, only to *fugitives*, and to fugitives escaping from one State into another. Of course, it has nothing, can have nothing, to do with persons held to service or labor under the laws of a State, shipped through the voluntary act of the master, and sent out upon the high seas, beyond State limits. If there be any constitutional provision in virtue of which slaves so shipped are held as such on the high seas, let the *Sentinel* point it out. Even the attempt to do this has never yet been made.

THE ISSUE—THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

We must not forget the position of the Independent Democracy, assailed by the *Washington Sentinel*, viz: that by the original policy of the fathers of the Republic, "Slavery was restricted within State limits, and Freedom was to be secured to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government." The first argument against this position, urged by that paper, that the slave trade was sanctioned, continued, and protected, by the fathers of the Republic, and therefore their original policy could not have been as stated in the Address, we disposed of yesterday.

The assertion made by the *Sentinel*, in connection with this argument—that slaves on the high seas in American vessels are held "as chattels, solely and exclusively by virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government"—as we showed, involved not only the affirmation of a Principle, fundamental in the creed of Independent Democracy, but the repudiation of the policy of Non-Intervention, as advocated by that journal.

Proceeding, then, to examine whether it was true or false, we showed that there was no provision in the Constitution of the United States, in virtue of which slaves on board American vessels on the high seas could be continued as such.

At this point we resume the argument. We admit that there is a *law* of Congress, *assuming* jurisdiction over the transportation of slaves coastwise, and recognising them as slaves on their passage from one port to another in the United States. It is part and parcel of the act passed by Congress in 1807, for the abolition of the *foreign* slave trade, and the object of it was to *prevent the coastwise trade in slaves* who might be brought from Cuba, or Africa, or other foreign countries, *in evasion of the act.* It was not *intended* to encourage, or sanction, or protect the coastwise trade in slaves; the framers of the act were intent upon another object, seeking indeed in good faith to carry out the original policy of the fathers of the Republic. So exclusively was their attention directed to this end, that they overlooked the *implied* sanction contained in the *terms* of the act to the transportation of slaves coastwise. The sections containing this implication, but designed to prevent infraction or invasion of the prohibition against the *importation* of slaves, provided that slaves should not be transported coastwise from one port to another in the United States, in vessels under forty tons burden, that all slaves thus transported should be described particularly in the manifests, and that the shipper should swear that they were not imported into the United States after January 1, 1808.

The existence of these provisions proves nothing against the position, taken in the Address in respect to the "original policy of the fathers of the Republic," because the *great object* of the law of which they are a part, was to carry out the original policy of Slavery restriction, and because their real intent was simply to prevent the fraudulent evasion of the Law; but, if this be denied, and if we admit, for the sake of the argument, that their *intent* as well as effect was to protect and encourage Slavery outside of State limits and within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government, then they prove a *departure* from that "*original* policy," and not its non-existence.

Apart from the bearings of these provisions on the general argument, do they sustain the assumption of the *Sentinel*, that slaves are held as such in American vessels on the high seas, in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government? If they do, they are unconstitutional, and incompatible with the policy and the doctrine of non-intervention. Where is power conferred in the Constitution, on Congress, to make or hold a slave? It can no more make a slave than a king, as was well said by a Democratic member of Congress. Not only is no power conferred to make or continue Slavery, but the General Government is positively restricted from depriving any person of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, without due process of law.

If the provisions of the act of 1807, then, are designed to continue the *status* of Slavery on the high seas, from the moment the slaves, shipped at an American port, pass beyond State jurisdiction, they are clearly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void.

That they are incompatible under every aspect with the doctrine of Non-Intervention, scarcely needs an argument. If their design be as just stated, or if, in the language of the *Sentinel*, they sanction and protect Slavery on the high seas, they constitute a clear case of flagrant Intervention with Slavery by the General Government, which the *Sentinel*, if true to its own creed, must unite with us in denouncing.

The truth is, *legal* Slavery—we use the phrase as generally understood in all sections of our country—never exists under the American flag, on the high seas, outside of the jurisdiction of a State. The slave code of the State stops at "State limits," has no *extra-territorial* force. To claim that the law of Virginia or Kentucky can stamp upon a man the ineffaceable character of a slave, is to claim that it is at once *universal* and *supreme*. The *Sentinel* does well to reject the absurdity that slaves, under the American flag on the high seas, are held or continued as slaves by State law. And there is no Federal Law, ordaining or continuing Slavery in such circumstances. How would it look?

"*Whereas* the transportation of slaves under the American flag, coastwise, is a great convenience to the Planters and Slave traders; *And whereas* the State Laws under which slaves are held have no binding force beyond State limits, and slaves shipped at any port within a State, cannot be held as such, on the high seas, which are beyond State jurisdiction—

"*Therefore*, Be it enacted by the United States in Congress assembled, that Slavery be, and hereby is, legalized, in all American vessels, on the ocean, beyond State jurisdiction, and no person, shipped as a slave at any port within the United States, shall be released

from bondage, on passing out of State jurisdiction into Federal, but shall be continued therein, by virtue of said Federal Jurisdiction."

This is putting the case in a light which the masses can understand. They know that no such law exists—that no such law could be enacted—that there is no provision in the Constitution which could be tortured into a warrant for such a law.

The truth is, the coastwise slave trade is illegal and piratical. Every slave shipped at a Southern port, the moment he passes out on the ocean beyond State jurisdiction, is free; the American flag that covers him then covers a freeman; the captain who conveys him to another port, to be sold, is guilty of transporting a free man to Slavery; and he who buys him buys a free man.

We pass from this incidental point, to the second consideration urged by the *Sentinel*, against the position under discussion:

"Again, in the national Territories, over which the 'General Government exercises exclusive jurisdiction,' Slavery has always existed among the Indians, admitted and protected by 'the national exclusive jurisdiction.' If the National Government had no right to interfere with Indian law to 'secure freedom to every one outside State limits,' interfering with the Indian law, then Slavery was a municipal law of the Indians, entitled to respect as any other municipal law, and of course admitting, re-organising, and protecting Slavery. Thus the 'policy of the fathers of the Republic' gave countenance to Slavery co-extensive with Indian population."

We shall not undertake to contest the assertion as to the existence of Slavery among the Indians, from the time of the organization of the Government. To what extent it is true, and with what limitations it should be received, we presume the *Sentinel* knows no more than we do, and that, we must confess, is very little. The answer to, it considered as an argument against the position of the address, is obvious and conclusive. Slavery has existed among the Indians, either as incorporated under the Government of a State with the citizens thereof, or as distinct, independent communities; in neither case, therefore, *within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government.*

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

The chances of the passage of the Nebraska Bill in its present shape become more and more doubtful. The speech of Gen. Houston against it, in which he stood up manfully for the Missouri Compromise, condemned without qualification the attempt to repeal or set it aside, and committed himself decidedly against every movement hostile to it, has inspirited the advocates of good faith. Representing an extreme Southern State, how honorably his position contrasts with that of the New Hampshire politician, who occupies the White House! We have often said that if we are obliged to choose for the Presidency between an honorable, high-minded Southern man, and a Northern man, dominated by Slavery, by all odds, give us the former.

In the Senate, yesterday, the question being taken on the amendment proposed by Mr. Douglas, to strike out from the 14th section of the bill, the following words—

"That the Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the 8th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise Measures,' and is hereby declared inoperative."—

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Which being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise Measures,' is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States"—

It was carried by the following vote—

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Atchison, Bayard, Bell, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clayton, Dawson, Dixon, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Geyer, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Sebastian, Slidell, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Toombs, Weller, Williams—35.

NAYS—Messrs Allen, Chase, Dodge of Wisconsin, Everett, Fish, Foot, Houston, Seward, Sumner, Wade—10.

The amendment differs in no respect from the clause stricken out, except in substituting the words, "*inconsistent with*," for "*superseded by*." The section now declares this untruth—that the Compromise of 1820, which was confined to the Territory of Louisiana, "is inconsistent with the principle of the legislation of 1850," which was confined to the territories acquired from Mexico. The Senate might just as truthfully declare that the Ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwest Territory, was "inconsistent with" the act of 1812, for the formation of a Territorial Government in Missouri. Then, a right was asserted in one case, which was not asserted or exercised in the other; and in 1820, a right was asserted, which was waived in 1850. But, because Congress in one act may assert a right, which, for reasons satisfactory to itself, it waives in another act, it does not follow that the acts are inconsistent with each other.

Not a Southern Whig voted against the amendment, and General Houston was the only Southern Democrat. Northern Whigs will please take notice that Senators Clayton and Bell, from whom they have been expecting better things, voted for it! Let them go.

The hollowness of the plea in behalf of the principle of self-government, set up by the advocates of the Bill, which we took special pains to expose about a week since, is, we are glad to see, about to be brought to the test. In the Senate, yesterday, they were unexpectedly disturbed by the following amendment submitted by Mr. Chase to the same section:

"Under which the people of the Territories, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit Slavery therein."

Whereupon a protracted discussion arose, which was terminated by an adjournment. We shall see how many of these advocates of "self-government" will vote that the People of a Territory have a right to exclude Slavery. The Bill itself, in proposing a form of Government for the Territory, providing for the distribution of its various powers, and the appointment of Executive officers by the President, gives the lie to their professions. To be consistent, they should abandon it, and introduce a simple resolution, recognising the right of the People in the Territory to organize their own Government, determine its powers, and elect all their own officers.

The prospect now is, that the discussion on the Bill will be protracted in the Senate, far beyond the intention of its authors. Its opponents are prepared for a vigorous resistance, and its friends will be compelled to define positions and guard against "the fire in the rear."

In the House, the debate has been opened, although the particular subject under consideration was the Homestead Bill. Mr. Mace, a Democratic member from Indiana, led off in a strong speech against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and was followed by Mr. Skelton, a Democratic member from New Jersey, on the same side. Both are what are called Old Line Democrats.

Mr. Meacham, a Whig member from Vermont, speaking against the same measure, Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, a supporter of the Douglas bill, undertook to gag him. The Chair stated that the usage had been to allow members in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to speak upon topics not immediately connected with that under consideration; but the rules of the House were against the usage, and he must decide in accordance with the rules. The promptitude with which the Committee overruled the decision, thereby allowing Mr. Meacham to proceed, shows that discussion on the Nebraska Question cannot be prevented. The spirited speech of Mr. Fenton, (a "Soft," from New York,) in the House yesterday, is another favorable indication. He denied the right of Ex-Governor Smith, of Virginia, to prescribe a test for the Democracy, and told him, that if the Nebraska bill was to be that test, he would find "Softs" springing up all over the North.

But, let no one be deceived. Were the vote to be taken to-day, we should dread the result. The free States have 144 members of the present House, the slave States, 85—majority of the former, 59. The Representatives of the slave States will probably be united in support of Repeal, and all they have to do is to secure thirty votes from the North and West. These and more are calculated upon by the advocates of Repeal. An Administration, wielding the power of Slavery, and backed by such men as Cass and Douglas, that could not command thirty Northern and Western votes for a measure, designed now to be its leading measure, would be set down as very imbecile or unreliable.

Let the People therefore be admonished that there is danger, imminent danger, such only as they by prompt and stern demonstrations all over the North and West can dissipate.

THE POLICY OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELATION TO SLAVERY.

The advocates of the policy of Non-Intervention by the Federal Government in relation to Slavery, say that it is the only constitutional, democratic, safe, and beneficent policy, "old as the Government itself, and founded upon the doctrine of strict construction."

Let us test them.

Congress was empowered by the Constitution to put an end to the slave trade in 1808, and thereby cut off the supply of foreign slaves to the Southern market, and it did exercise this power the moment it had the right to do so. This was Intervention. Was it constitutional, democratic, safe, and beneficent?

A clause was inserted in the Constitution, stipulating that a person held to service or labor in one State, escaping into another, should be delivered up on claim, &c. As this was by its very terms a clause of compact, containing and implying no grant of power to Congress to provide for its execution, but to be fulfilled by the States, we hold that its intent and effect were, not to impose any duty of Intervention on the part of the Federal Government. But, Congress assumed power, in 1793, over the subject, and passed a law to carry into effect this provision, and in 1850 again assumed power, passing another law far more stringent and arbitrary, for the same purpose. Was not this, Intervention by the Federal Government with Slavery? And who are responsible for it but these same noisy advocates of Non-Intervention as the only true policy?

Congress, in 1802, re-enacted the entire slave code of Virginia and Maryland, in the ten miles square ceded by those States to the General Government; and Slavery to this day exists in this District, in virtue alone of Congressional enactment.

Is this Intervention, constitutional, democratic, safe, and beneficent? O, yes!

Congress, in 1798, prohibited the importation of any slaves into the Territory of Mississippi, brought from without the limits of the United States, under heavy penalties, providing at the same time that any slaves imported in violation of the law should at once receive their freedom. Was this Non-Intervention? Was the law constitutional, democratic, safe, beneficent?

Congress, in 1804, not only enacted a similar law in relation to the Territory of Louisiana, but it prohibited any slave from being carried into that Territory, except by a citizen of the United States, the *bona fide* owner of such slave, removing to the Territory for actual settlement.

Was this Non-Intervention? Was the law constitutional, democratic, safe, beneficent?

Congress, in 1807, enacted a law regulating the traffic in slaves coastwise.

Was this Non-Intervention?

The Federal Executive, when the Spanish colonies on the continent revolted, and their armies were meditating a descent upon Cuba, which they had a perfect right to seize and revolutionize, if they could, admonished them sternly that the Government of the United States could not tolerate any such act, as it would inevitably involve the emancipation of the slaves in Cuba, and thereby endanger the stability of the slave system in the South.

Slaveholders and their Northern allies, the pretended advocates of Non-Intervention, have always approved of that gross act of Intervention, just as they have approved of the more recent threats of the Administration, through its "organ" in Washington, to intervene for the preservation of Slavery in Cuba, against the efforts of Great Britain and France in favor of its abolition. Yes—this very "organ," with its brazen throat speaking fiercely for Non-Intervention, had the hardihood a few weeks ago to threaten Spain with the Intervention of the Federal Government, *vi et armis*, to preserve the Slavery of the African race in Cuba!

The records of our Diplomacy show that formerly repeated attempts were made by the Government of the United States to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain for the reclamation of fugitive slaves from the South, finding a refuge in Canada; and that a few years ago formal demands were made upon the British Government, and urged with great pertinacity, for compensation for slaves in American vessels driven by stress of weather into British ports. Was that Non-Intervention?

The truth is, historically, Non-Intervention is a lie. It has never been the policy of the General Government; it is not now its policy. The advocates of it do not believe it, dare not trust it, dare not follow it out to its legitimate consequences. What! will they vote for the repeal of the law re-enacting the slave code in the District of Columbia, for the repeal of the law regulating the coastwise slave trade, for the repeal of the law of 1793 and that of 1850, on the subject of fugitives from service or labor? Will they join with us in condemning the action of the Federal Executive in upholding Slavery in Cuba, and in demanding fugitive slaves from Great Britain? What is their real meaning? Simply this: that Intervention, when it will answer the purposes of Slavery, is a great and glorious Principle of Democracy; but, when it will inure to the benefit of Freedom, is unconstitutional and anti-Democratic; that Intervention is always wrong when *against* Slavery, always right when *for* Slavery.

Non-Intervention! The bald humbug! Leave the People of a Territory free to govern themselves—they have the right—the principle of popular self-government is coeval with the Constitution, founded upon strict construction, Democratic, all-glorious:—*therefore* — what? "WE, the Representatives of the thirty-one States of this Union, will ordain a Constitution of Government for the settlers in Nebraska, who have no voice in our election; we will decide who of them shall vote; who shall be eligible to office; how many and what offices there shall be; how they shall be filled; what salaries shall be attached to them; what shall be the nature and extent of their functions: we will not allow them to elect their Judges, their Secretary of State, their Governor: we will apply to them all the laws of the United States we think applicable to their condition: and we will require that whatever laws may be passed by the Territorial Legislature shall be submitted to us."

And yet we are called upon to admire the *Principle of Self-Government*, as applied to the People of a Territory! The Bill of Mr. Douglas is itself a total denial of this Principle in such an application.

And then, the People are to be cheated with another fraud. Let the Territorial Legislature regulate the subject of Slavery as its constituents may decide, subject to the Constitution of the United States. "This is the doctrine," shout the paid presses of Slavery at the North; "who will not trust the People? No fear that Slavery will be introduced into Nebraska, if they are left to decide the question. Better for Freedom than all the Congressional legislation in the world!"

Have honor, fair dealing, common honesty, ceased to exist? Do not these presses know that they are guilty of infamous deception? Their masters at the South *deny* that a Territorial Legislature has the power to exclude Slavery. Fortunately, the following article from the *Charleston* (*S. C.*) *Mercury*, furnishes a timely exposure of the imposition they are attempting upon the People of the North. There is one thing about Masterdom that exalts it heaven-high above the supple Servility that bends the knee before it—it is too proud to sneak, too audacious to play the hypocrite. Read what follows, and then say what you think of Self-Government, Non-Intervention, and other humbugs, peddled at the North:

"*Senator Douglas—Squatter Sovereignty.*—The *Boston Post*, in commenting upon this gentleman's recent speech, takes much pleasure in finding, as it asserts, its favorite doctrine of SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY, OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORY TO LEGISLATE UPON ALL LEGAL SUBJECTS, AND THEREBY TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY, fully maintained and vindicated. WE CANNOT ASSENT TO ANY SUCH CONSTRUCTION of the speech, and of the bill which it sustains, without imputing duplicity to the former, and an unconstitutional character to the latter. *For, if it is intended to be argued by Senator Douglas, that in creating Territorial Governments, invested with the usual powers, they can legislate so as to exclude and abolish Slavery, when the very law which organizes them declares the Territories open to the immigration and settlement of the slaveholder*, we must reject such a proposition as not only unconstitutional, but as containing upon its very face the mark of treachery. It would indeed be the climax of specious justice, to proclaim Non-Intervention on the part of Congress as the principle of fairness and the Constitution, yet that it should pass a law CONFERRING UPON A TENT-FULL OF HUNTERS AND OUTLAWS THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE IN THE MOST ABSOLUTE AND SOVEREIGN MANNER. If the Compromise of 1850, and the present bill for the admission of Nebraska, really mean anything of fairness and justice to the South, if the latter be not intended as a trap to catch her support for a principle seemingly of value to her, *we are not in error in saying to slaveholders, here lies this Territory, go into it with your property, if you will, and you shall be safe, until, as a sovereign State, the people decide for or against the institution.* Otherwise the Nebraska bill is a worthless and deceptive truce.

"But we mistake Mr. Douglas if such an inference can be properly drawn from his argument and bill. Indeed, whatever may be his own views on the subject, *the bill itself provides, in the first place, that all laws passed by the Territorial Government, 'shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and if disapproved, shall be null and of no effect.'* Secondly, that '*all cases involving title to slaves and questions of personal freedom, shall be subject to the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.*' So far, therefore, from these Governments being empowered to exclude Slavery, any action they may take upon the subject would be a matter for discussion and decision, both by Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States. Should the issue arise upon a law excluding or abolishing Slavery, the question of the power to pass such a law would be the first inquiry; and a decision which acknowledged that power in the teeth of proclaimed non-intervention, and the rights of the slaveholder, would be as iniquitous as it is absurd. It would be Congressional intervention one step removed, not so direct as the Missouri Compromise or the Wilmot Proviso, but more insidious and fatal, because, while professing equality in theory, Congress and the Supreme Court would become the instruments of wrong, wielded by the hands of others."

THE NEW SENATOR FROM MAINE.

The *Portland* (Me.) *Inquirer*, the organ of the Free Soil or Independent Democratic party in Maine, rejoices over the election to the United States Senate of Wiliam Pitt Fessenden. We presume the statement it makes may be relied upon; if so, it has reason for its rejoicing. It says:

"He is not elected as a *party* man, but as an *honest* man, irrespective of party, and *above* party, for the purposes of just and truly Democratic Government. No one party had the power to elect him, and to no one party does he owe special allegiance or obligation. Three parties combined have secured this result. True, one vote in the House and three in the Senate were given for Dr. Hubbard, but with the intention of concentrating every vote on Fessenden at the second ballot. Mr. A. P. Morrill and his friends were as firm and true for him as any other men.

"The Free Democratic party cast a solid vote for him in both branches. And they did not do it blindly, nor inconsiderately, but on solid grounds, such as would have received the ready approbation of every reasonable friend of Freedom in the State. Mr. Fessenden goes to Congress to maintain the cause of Freedom. *He fully adopts its principles and objects, as advocated by the Free Democracy*; and it is matter of devout congratulation that Maine has been able at this crisis to send such a man there.

"It is remarkable that the party of Freedom in this State has decided the election of both of our Senators in Congress. It is a proud fact, illustrating its value and its power. The party now sends Mr. Fessenden to join Mr. Hamlin, and support him in his firm resistance to the present demands of the slave power. Had it not been for this party, both seats would now be filled by the supple tools of that power. Such facts will win to us the hearts of the People. *Nine round cheers for the election of William Pitt Fessenden!!*"

When co-operation between Free-Soilers and members of other parties accomplishes such results, it is worthy of all praise.

PAULDING DEMOCRAT.

This excellent paper has been recently established at Paulding, Paulding county, Ohio, by Mr. A. S. Latty. The editor is a warm-hearted, well-informed Irishman, one of the most prominent among the Old Line Democrats in his section of the State, who with thousands more cannot abide the recent endorsement of the Baltimore platform in Ohio. His paper is devoted to the advocacy of Democracy as set forth in the Ohio platform, as it was before the late surrender to the Slave Power—which is the same Democracy, indeed, as is taught in the Columbus and Pittsburgh Independent Democratic platforms. Mr. Latty is an able writer, and his paper cannot fail to do most effective service to the cause of Freedom and Progress. We hope our friends in Ohio, and particularly in northwestern Ohio, will see that it receives a liberal support.

LITERARY NOTICES.

DOVECOTE; OR, THE HEART OF THE HOMESTEAD. By the author of Cap Sheaf. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Sold by Taylor & Maury, Washington. 1 vol. Pp. 300.

A pleasant picture of home-life in the country—of life among woods and hills and streams and fields, where the sweet influences of Nature are free to play around the heart like summer wind.

The story of Milly, the "poor waif of the world," which is like a silver thread running through the book, is simple and touching. The author has drawn from a full heart, rich in sweet home affections and dear old memories—a heart that has communed with Nature in all her varied forms, sought out her green shady nooks, and lingered in her quiet haunts, till it has become familiar with every lineament of her lovely face. It is a book to dream over. As the author says in his preface, "the reader will find the quiet dreams at the hearth, the glowing visions in the woods and on the hills, the sweet memories that swarm in the old garret and barns, and the pleasant meditations that flow out of the heart by the brook and the river."

We, too, have "sweet memories" of an old homestead in the country, girdled by green hills and smiling fields, where the sun shone brighter than anywhere else; and we thank the author of "Dovecote" for the pleasant glimpse he has given us, as through a mirror, of the bright days of our own childhood and childhood's home. G.

MRS. BEN DARBY; OR, THE WEAL AND WOE OF SOCIAL LIFE. By A. Maria Collins. Cincinnati: Moore, Anderson, Wilstach, & Keys. Sold by Gray & Ballantyne, Washington. 1 vol. Pp. 367.

This is a work of great power—the best temperance tale we have ever read. The pictures of social life are skilfully drawn, and with a truth and vividness that stirs the soul. Who can read "Mrs. Ben Darby," and ever again put the maddening wine-cup to his lips?

There is, as the author has intimated, another slavery beside that of the negro race—a slavery that is felt in high places, and carries in its train madness and ruin. The slavery of the negro is the slavery of the *body*—the slavery of the *inebriate* is the slavery of body and *soul!*

The volume is deserving of high commendation, and we hope it may be extensively read. G.

AN ATTIC PHILOSOPHER IN PARIS; or, a Peep at the World from a Garret. Being the Journal of a Happy Man. From the French of Emile Souvestre.

So many unhappy people have written journals, and they are usually filled with such morbid, egotistical, unhealthy stuff, that few people of good taste will read them. But this book is what it purports to be; and there is a religious sentiment pervading it, which is by no means common in popular books, and especially in French literature.

Farnham has it for sale.

LINNY LOCKWOOD. A Novel. By Catharine Crowe, author of "Susan Hopley," "Lilly Dawson," "Night Side of Nature," &c. New York: Appleton & Co.

We cannot speak critically of this book, for we have not read it. But, turning over its pages, we have seen enough to venture the assertion that it is a clever, spirited sketch of English life and manners, and will serve as well as another to amuse an idle hour.

For sale by Farnham.

EXTRACTS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

A subscriber sends us the proceedings of a meeting at Poughkeepsie, Dutchess county, N. Y., in Mr. Dean's district, held February 13th, for the purpose of denouncing the attempt now on foot to repeal the Missouri Compromise. Hon. Abraham Baker, aided by several Vice Presidents, presided. Speeches were made by W. Wilkinson, C. Bartlett, James Emmett, and W. H. Van Wagner. Among the resolutions adopted were the following:

"*Resolved*, That there are limits to political generosity and forbearance, beyond which concessions, ceasing to be laudable and patriotic, become degrading and ignominious.

"*Resolved*, That whether we have regard to constitutions, laws, compacts, compromises, or to the teachings and examples of Washington, Jefferson, and other sages and patriots of the Revolution, we are constrained to feel and to avow that the bill of Senator Douglas, repealing the Missouri Compromise, and opening the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska to the admission of Slavery, is uncalled for, anti-republican in its principles and tendencies, a gross breach of plighted faith, a fountain of political demoralization and of national discord—a bill, in fine, fraught with the greatest evils, both present and prospective, to our own country."

Our correspondent adds, that Mr. Dean, being on a visit to his constituents, lately, found the feeling against the bill much stronger than he had supposed.

A subscriber from Wilmot's district, Pennsylvania, writes, that great excitement prevails there, and a call for a public meeting at Towanda, Bradford county, headed by David Wilmot, has been issued.

Oxford, Michigan, Feb. 9.—"The Nebraska Territorial bill has awakened profound interest. We shall protest against it by petitions, and sustain the Independent Democrats in the position they have taken. Would to God we had a voice in Congress of the same sort!"

Meetings to protest against the bill are announced all over the free States.

A subscriber at Whitewater, Wisconsin, writes: "These are perilous times for Freedom. The Nebraska bill out-Herod's Herod. Northern dough has become so soft that it can hardly keep its shape over night. We in this State are living on soil free from Slavery, through the operation of the Ordinance of 1787, and it grieves us to see the dark cloud of Slavery spreading towards territory entitled to the same boon by the legislation of 1820."

CHARLESTON, S. C., *Feb.* 14, 1854.

Southern Representatives! a call is now made on your wisdom, which will put it to a most severe test. Beware! from your action now on this devilish bill, you will be rewarded in future times, either by the grateful remembrance or the hearty maledictions of the Southern People. Reflect deeply upon this matter. If you allow yourselves to be caught on that gilded bait, a stain will be fastened on the reputation of your constituents which will be most difficult ever to remove. If, on the contrary, you show yourselves their true Representatives, you will establish on a firmer basis than ever that reputation for honesty and magnanimity which is the essential feature of its character.

V. K.

ST. LOUIS, *Feb.* 7, 1854.

I have clipped a short article from the *Evening News*, to show you how we stand here on the Nebraska question. With only one exception, the press in St. Louis is opposed to Douglas's bill, or in any way disturbing the Missouri Compromise. If the People are aroused in time, the bill cannot pass. I believe that the only friends of the bill here are the revilers of Col. Benton, and they favor it more out of hatred to him than from any other cause, presuming that he will cast his influence against it.

MARTIN'S FERRY, O., *Feb.* 8, 1854.

A petition against the pro-slavery clause of the Nebraska bill, now before Congress, is circulating and obtaining the signatures of almost all to whom it is offered; but the people everywhere feel much more than they express upon this subject. So little has heretofore been effected in staying the encroachments of Slavery by public meetings and petitions, that a strong determination is felt by many to make themselves heard in a more effectual manner. If any of Ohio's representatives are so lost to virtue and honor as to be willing to sustain that odious clause in the bill, let them count the cost. Their reward will be political death, and a name hereafter that their descendants will blush to own, or I am no prophet. And let the South beware, lest they find that, contrary to all former indications, the North has yet a conscience, and a deep-seated abhorrence of oppression, slumbering though it has been beneath the obscurity of a misguided and mistaken selfishness. When conscience, the love of liberty, and the omnipotent dollar, are on one side, they may awake and shake from their limbs the fetters that Slavery has hung about them to retard their progress.

LEE, MAINE, *Feb.* 8, 1854.

I am glad you give so much attention to the Nebraska question. The people are waking up. I have not found a Whig or Democrat who is not opposed to Douglas's bill.

☞ In our advertising columns will be found a very generous offer from Wm. Birney, editor of the *Philadelphia Daily Register*, to Reading-Room Associations.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

Senate, Tuesday, Feb. 14, 1854.

The galleries were crowded at an early hour, in the expectation of hearing the Hon. Sam. Houston speak on the Nebraska Bill.

The Chair laid before the Senate a communication from General Armstrong, of the *Union*, asking to be released from the engagement between that paper and the Senate, for the publication of its debates and proceedings.

Mr. Johnson submitted a resolution, that John C. Rives furnish the Senate with an equal number of the proceedings of both Houses, that he now furnishes to the House.

Mr. Seward and Mr. Brodhead presented memorials from New York and Pennsylvania, against the passage of any act repealing or abrogating the Missouri Compromise.

Mr. Bayard presented memorials in favor of Congress adopting the principle of Congressional non-intervention in all Territorial Bills.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill providing for the settlement of the claims of American citizens for spoliations committed by the French prior to 1800.

The bill was then passed—yeas 26, nays 17—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Badger, Bayard, Bell, Dawson, Evans, Fish, Foot, Hamlin, Houston, James, Jones of Tennessee, Mallory, Morton, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Sebastian, Seward, Shields, Smith, Sumner, Toombs, Wade, Weller, and Wright—26.

NAYS—Messrs. Adams, Bright, Brown, Cass, Chase, Clay, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Jones of Iowa, Mason, Norris, Rusk, Slidell, Walker, and Williams—17.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of the bill to establish a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Houston then addressed the Senate in defence and vindication of the Indians. He traced the history of the Cherokees from the time of the treaty of 1785 down to their location in the present Territory of Nebraska, which was guarantied them by the most sacred pledges of the Government, that in the enjoyment of this home they should never be disturbed.

He accused the Government of bad faith, and asked when had the Government ever done an honest act, or fulfilled any promise with respect to the Indians? He advocated the policy of furnishing Indians with food and the means of prosecuting agriculture, in which they would soon become civilized and christianized communities. The present policy of keeping up armed posts, &c., cost more than would in a few years christianize and civilize every Indian east of the Rocky Mountains. He elaborated these points at great length.

Mr. Houston had not concluded, when he yielded the floor, and the subject was postponed.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of Executive business.

House of Representatives, Feb. 14, 1854.

The following is the Committee of Inquiry, appointed in pursuance of the resolution of Mr. Mace, to make investigations respecting certain ocean mail steamers, &c., viz: Messrs. Mace, Goode, Walsh, Reese, Kittredge, Pennington, Elliott, J. C. Allen, and Puryear.

Mr. Stanton proposed a resolution, to authorize the printing of 10,000 copies of the Patent Report for 1853–'4, for the use of that office, and 30,000, for the use of the House. The latter number was, on motion of Mr. Straub, increased to 50,000; and the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, the House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Homestead Bill, Mr. Olds in the chair.

This bill is entitled: "A bill to encourage agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and all other branches of industry, by granting to every man, who is the head of a family, and a citizen of the United States, a homestead of 160 acres of land, out of the public domain, upon condition of occupancy and cultivation of the same, for the period herein specified."

Mr. Dawson addressed the Committee at length, in support of this bill.

Mr. Mace arose, and said that he proposed, for the first time in his life, to deliver a speech from the manuscript. He said that he would speak upon the bill which had been reported to this House from the Committee on Territories, and which was identical with that now before the Senate in relation to Nebraska.

In order that he might not be catechised in the course of his remarks, he said he would explain his past course upon all kindred questions. He proceeded to do so, and showed that he had never occupied a position antagonistic to the interests of the slave States.

The Compromise of 1850 did not, in his opinion, repeal the Compromise of 1820—a compact that had been made in good faith, and approved, sanctioned, and re-affirmed, in all the subsequent legislation of the country bearing directly or indirectly upon the subject.

The present is the first time, the speaker said, that Slavery has formed the basis of *party* divisions. In all former times the boast appeared to be that one party contained more Pro-Slavery men than the other.

It had been said in the Senate that Mr. Clay himself doubted the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise. If this were so, all history in relation to it must be false; and if Mr. Clay were now alive, not only would this statement not be made, but a proposition to repeal that Compromise would hardly be made in any body of which he was a member.

Mr. Mace related incidents of the history of the Compromise of 1850, and descanted upon the nature of the concessions then made. He said they were made by the North in good faith, and that their boasted finality was honestly believed in. He was still speaking, when our report closed.

Senate, Wednesday, Feb. 15, 1854.

Mr. Fish presented the remonstrance of the Society of Friends of New York, against the passage of any act allowing an extension of the area of Slavery.

The French Spoliation bill, which was yesterday ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was taken up and passed—yeas 27, nays 15.

The following bills were severally taken up and passed:

A bill ceding to Ohio the public lands in that State remaining unsold and unappropriated on the 31st of March, 1854.

A bill relinquishing to the city of Dubuque, Iowa, certain land occupied as a grave-yard.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill to establish a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Houston said that, though yet extremely unwell, he would, if possible, conclude his remarks to-day. He would do so, though he could not understand that there was any public interests requiring urgency in the passage of this bill. He thought that the boundaries of Kansas might be so fixed as not to include them within any Territorial Government.

He repeated his views of the high character of the Indians for honor and probity, and asserted that no instance could be found wherein the Indians had ever broken a treaty. He was for civilizing and Christianizing the Indians. He was opposed to the bill because it connected three great subjects into one bill. These subjects were Nebraska, where no sufficient population existed; the Kansas Territory, which was entirely Indian country; and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

He read a letter published in the *Richmond Enquirer*, in which his opposition to the bill was anticipated and denounced. He replied to the charges, and said that he would not degrade himself to the level of the writer by hating him.

He was opposed to all the provisions of this bill relating to the Indians; and if anything in the bill could be more repugnant to him than those provisions, it was the one relating to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. He was opposed to the repeal of that measure because we had always stood upon it. He stood upon it on the Oregon bill, and the South had sustained him. That Compromise formed part of the supreme law of Texas. He stood firmly upon the Compromise acts of 1850. He was the only Senator now present who had voted for every measure embraced in the Compromise of 1850. In voting for it, he never supposed he was voting for a repeal of the Missouri Compromise. It was a finality of this Slavery agitation. It had been so accepted and approved by the people of the United States. Would not the repeal of the Missouri compact lead to excitement and agitation? If one compact was to be set aside, was it not an authority and sanction for trampling the other under foot?

Though party lines no longer existed to any great extent, he would support this Administration by voting against this bill, on the principles avowed by the President in his letter accepting the nomination at the hands of the Convention at Baltimore. That Convention laid down a platform, that the Democratic party would forever resist slavery agitation in any shape or form.

The President endorsed this resolution; so did the candidate for Vice President. He read the resolutions of the Baltimore platform, and the letters of Messrs. Pierce and King, and contended that in preserving this compact, he was supporting the principle of non-agitation of Slavery then avowed by them.

The South had not asked for this measure. It would be no benefit to the South. It would be a measure which would apply the knife to the throat of the South. He came into Congress, over thirty years ago, upon this Missouri Compromise. There were but three in Congress now, who were then in Congress—they were Messrs. Benton, Everett, and himself.

He continued his remarks till half-past two.

The question was then taken on Mr. Douglas's amendment to the 14th section, and it was agreed to—yeas 35, nays 10.

Mr. Chase then submitted an amendment, to the effect that "the people of the Territory, through their appropriate Representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery therein."

Mr. Pratt proposed to amend by inserting "or permit," after the word "prohibit;" pending the consideration of which, our report closed.

House of Representatives, Feb. 15, 1854.

[After our report had closed yesterday, Mr. Skelton, of New Jersey, made, in Committee of the Whole, a very earnest and effective speech in opposition to the Nebraska Bill.]

The Speaker laid before the House a communication from the Treasury Department, transmitting a report relative to receipts of customs.

Mr. Bissell, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back the House bill referred to them, with the Senate's amendments, which bill awards four months' pay to each officer and soldier among the San Francisco sufferers. An amendment, embracing Lieut. Murray, of the Navy, was approved of. An amendment, granting pensions to the widows and heirs of those who perished, in like manner as though they had died in battle, was approved of. An amendment, ordering that advance payments made prior to embarcation be not deducted from the foregoing award, was not agreed to, Mr. Bissell having alleged that it would operate unequally, many having drawn no advance pay. [If the Senate shall insist on this amendment, a Committee of Conference will be necessary.]

Mr. Dean moved a suspension of the rules, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. But, the morning hour having not yet expired,

Mr. Breckenridge asked that he might first be allowed to state that he was instructed by the Committee of Ways and Means to say that that committee was ready to report a Deficiency bill.

Mr. Dean renewed his motion, and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Homestead bill, Mr. Olds in the chair, when

Mr. Meacham commenced a speech in opposition to the Nebraska bill. He was interrupted by Mr. Richardson, who stated that debate was not in order upon other than the special subject under consideration.

The Chair decided in accordance with this opinion.

Several gentlemen arose to controvert the decision of the Chair, and reminded him of the usage of the House.

The Chair stated that the usage of the House was to admit of a wide latitude of debate, but that the usage and the rules did not correspond, and he would decide according to the latter.

Mr. Washburn, of Maine, appealed from the decision of the Chair, and the House overruled the decision; when

Mr. Meacham resumed his speech, and entered into an elaborate argument in opposition to the Nebraska bill, reviewing the condition of the Territories, their history, the history of the removal of the Indian tribes inhabiting them, the means by which these Indians were removed thither, our guaranties to them, &c.

Mr. Fenton made a brief reply to the speech made some time since by Mr. Smith, of Virginia. He denied the right of that gentleman to prescribe a test for members on this floor; and if the Nebraska bill should be presented as that test, the gentleman would find "Softs" springing up all over the North.

Mr. Fenton gave his views on the Nebraska bill, and earnestly opposed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

The Committee then rose, and

Mr. Breckenridge, by consent, from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported a bill to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1854; which was read twice, and committed.

Mr. B. also asked leave to report from the same committee a bill to provide for the completion of certain custom-houses and marine hospitals therein mentioned.

Mr. Hamilton objected.

Mr. Haven, after stating that the Committee of Ways and Means desired this bill and the Deficiency bill to be introduced and referred together, which had been prevented by the objection of the gentleman from Maryland, moved to reconsider the vote by which the Deficiency bill was committed, that the Committee of Ways and Means might again get it in their possession.

After considerable conversation, without taking the question on the motion to reconsider,

The House adjourned.

Senate, Thursday, Feb. 16, 1854.

The Chair laid before the Senate a letter from Messrs. Tucker & Overton, publishers of the *Sentinel*, proposing to assume the contract lately given up by the *Union*, for publishing the Senate debates and proceedings.

Mr. Chase presented four memorials, praying that no act be passed repealing or abrogating the Missouri Compromise.

Mr. Sumner presented memorials from Massachusetts and Illinois, of a similar character.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill to establish a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Badger said that as the bill was first reported, the provisions it contained with reference to the Indians presented to his mind insuperable objections; it did not then, he thought, contain provisions sufficiently efficacious to preserve the plighted faith of the nation to the Indians. It gave them no practical power of refusing to cede their territories. These Indians had gone to this Territory under a solemn guarantee that they should not be dispossessed. Since then, the amendments made by the Committee on Indian Affairs had provided all the precautions which could reasonably be made, and the difficulty had been removed. The want of population was also an objection to his mind, but he had come to the conclusion that, under all the circumstances, that question was one of time only.

It was said that the Missouri Compromise was a solemn compact, and that to repeal it would be a violation of the plighted faith of the two sections of the Union. He designed to show that the language already put into the bill, that it was inconsistent with the legislation of 1850, was true and correct; and that the declaration that the Missouri act is inoperative and void was a true and proper declaration, and the only one that ought to be made.

The Senator from Connecticut had argued that the Missouri prohibition was intended only to apply to Territorial organizations, and not to States. He considered that that prohibition was intended to apply to the Territories for all time to come, whether under State or Territorial organization.

It was intended also to apply not only to all the territory of the United States at that time, but to all the territory which the United States might thereafter acquire. This was shown by the Texan resolutions, where, upon the annexation of Texas, the Missouri line was taken up and applied to that Territory, as a matter of course. It was clearly thought, in 1820, that Congress had the power to apply the prohibition to all organizations, State or otherwise, above 36 deg. 30 min. The principle on which the legislation of 1820 was based was absolutely set aside and repudiated by the legislation of 1850.

The Missouri Compromise was disregarded, within one year after its adoption, by the North. By the Compromise act, Missouri was to be admitted upon the adoption of her Constitution. When she applied with her Constitution, for admission, the House of Representatives rejected the application.

During the pendency of the Oregon bill and the acts of 1850, the South asked for nothing, sought for nothing, but the recognition of the Missouri Compromise, and it was refused. He read from the Journal of the Senate of the session of 1850, to show that the South had unitedly stood upon that line, and that those who now insisted upon its observance refused to give it.

House of Representatives, Feb. 16, 1854.

Mr. Millson moved to reconsider the vote by which the House bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, under the act of February 30, 1853, was yesterday committed to the Committee of the Whole; and spoke at some length upon the merits of the bill, denouncing it as partial in its bearings and exorbitant in its demands. He stated that its passage would entail upon the Government a disbursement of not less than two millions of dollars. It provides for pensions to widows of Revolutionary soldiers, though married since the year 1800.

The bill also proposes to give the pay proposed from 1848, and thus creates arrearages, to the amount of twelve hundred thousand dollars.

The vote was taken on the motion of Mr. Millson, and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 68, nays 65.

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Reports from various committees were then presented.

Mr. Chandler, from the Joint Committee on the Library, presented the resolution adopted by the Senate, voting to each member of Congress copies of the books heretofore distributed among them.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, moved to lay the resolution on the table; which was rejected.

The resolution was then adopted, the yeas and nays being refused.

Mr. Chandler, from the joint committee on the San Francisco sufferers, again presented the bill awarding medals to the three commanders, and a sum not more than $100,000 to the officers and men; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Breckenridge, from the Committee of Ways and Means, presented a bill making appropriations for the completion of certain custom-houses, &c.

On motion of Mr. Stephens, [at 8 minutes before 2 o'clock] the House went into Committee of the Whole, when

Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, arose and addressed the House on the subject of the tariff, reviewing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury, and opposing the views of that functionary.

Senate, Friday, Feb. 17, 1854.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill to establish a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Seward spoke for three hours in opposition to the Nebraska bill; when

Mr. Pettit moved the postponement of the further consideration of the bill to Monday next, expressing a wish to be heard that day.

Mr. Sumner desired to be heard on the question, and gave notice that he would follow Mr. Pettit on Tuesday.

The Senate adjourned till Monday.

House of Representatives, Feb. 17, 1854.

[After our report had closed, yesterday, Mr. Sapp addressed the Committee, in favor of the Homestead bill. Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, then obtained the floor, and the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.]

This morning, after the reading of the journal,

Mr. Dean presented a communication from the Governor of New York, enclosing the resolutions of the Legislature of that State, in opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and asked that they be read.

Mr. Mike Walsh objected to the reading, as did also Mr. Clingman.

The resolutions being received, the Speaker ruled that the reading of them was in order; and they were accordingly read.

Mr. Dean moved that they be laid on the table and printed; and it was so ordered.

Mr. Hillyer moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

The Speaker said that the special order of the day was the bill to indemnify the State of Indiana for failure to convey to it a township of land, and that the motion was not in order.

The bill was then read a second and third time, and finally passed—yeas 114, nays 47.

Mr. McMullen moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, when

Mr. Matteson arose, and stated that, during the discussion of the Nebraska question on Wednesday last, his inquiry of the Chairman of the Territorial Committee, whether certain amendments could be made in the bill at a future time, and the Chairman's answer in the affirmative, were omitted from the published report in the *Globe*.

Mr. Richardson arose and repelled the imputation (which Mr. Matteson vehemently denied having made) with great severity; but did not deny that the omission had been made.

Mr. McMullen's motion recurred, and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Olds in the chair.)

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, arose, and spoke on the Nebraska bill, in opposition to the views of Mr. Meachem, on Wednesday.

Mr. Stephens denied that the Missouri Compromise was a contract or compact. The line of 36 deg. 30 min. was drawn by legislative enactment, and nothing more. Missouri had *previously* been admitted.

The North was the first to violate this law. Upon the admission of Arkansas, the North renewed the contest. The North and the South had agreed, as Abraham and Lot had agreed, in the compact or law. Mr. Stephens reviewed the history of the events upward to 1850.

Mr. Stephens was strenuous in his opposition to all legislation by Congress on the subject of Slavery, and contended that no *republican* could claim the right of our Government to govern freemen after they had gone to dwell in the Territories.

Mr. Stephens compared the present manifestations of the opponents of the Nebraska bill to the hissings of demons—to the rebellion of spirits expelled from heaven—to the manifestations in Pandemonium. He feared no excitement. The North would not resist. The adder would hiss in vain. *It* had never been killed. The laws had been opposed in the North—Southern blood had been shed there.

He spoke of the threats of disregarding the Compromise with respect to Southern territory. But the South asked for nothing with this respect.

Mr. Campbell arose to reply. He yielded to none in reverence for this Union, and never, until he shall witness the subversion of the purposes for which the Union has been established, will he assent to its dissolution. But he had never believed that conquests were to be made for the purpose of propagating Slavery.

Mr. Campbell addressed the House.

Mr. Giddings made a brief explanation of some historical facts in connection with the purchase of Louisiana; after which, the Committee rose,

And the House adjourned until Monday.

Senate, Monday, February 20, 1854.

Numerous petitions, protesting against the passage of the Nebraska bill, or any other act repealing or abrogating the Missouri Compromise, by Messrs. Seward, Wade, Everett, Fish, Chase, Sumner, and Brodhead.

Mr. Johnson introduced a bill to establish three Indian Territories in the country west of Arkansas. He said it proposed to give an answer to the anxious question, as to what was to become of the Indians. This bill provided a kind of Government for the Indians, which was calculated to encourage them in civilization, and induce them to become citizens of the United States, and ultimately be admitted to the enjoyment of self-government. He moved that one thousand extra copies of the bill be printed for the purpose of distribution among the Indians, in order that their views may be ascertained. The motion was agreed to, and the bill referred.

House resolution, authorizing a supplemental contract for supplying marble for the Capitol, was taken up and passed.

Mr. Shields introduced a bill, making Cairo, Illinois, a port of delivery.

Mr. Benjamin reported a bill, making appropriations for the improvement of the mouths of the Mississippi, and moved that it be taken up.

Mr. Stuart objected to the consideration of the bill. He would oppose all separate bills for such improvements. He was for a general measure.

The motion was not agreed to.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the bill to establish a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Pettit addressed the Senate.

House of Representatives, Feb. 20, 1854.

Mr. Latham, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported back the Senate bill extending the pre-emption law of California, with an amendment, recommending its passage. Mr. L. explained at some length the necessity of the enactment, and urged its immediate passage.

Mr. Washburn, of Illinois, expressed his approval of the objects of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. Ewing, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, (Mr. Olds in the chair,) when

Mr. Noble arose and addressed the Committee on the proposition to impose tonnage duties as a means of keeping in order the rivers and harbors of the country.

Mr. N. regarded the plan now proposed as unconstitutional, as pernicious, and as destructive to the commerce of the Western lakes and rivers; and he spoke at length in support of these declarations.

Mr. Keitt disavowed having committed Mr. Calhoun to any specific or detailed plan of tonnage duties.

Mr. Ewing addressed the House on the Territorial bill, his main object being to show that Mr. Clay had never supported the Missouri line, but had repudiated it.

He quoted from a speech of Mr. Clay, in which that gentleman disavowed the authorship of the Compromise establishing such a line. He showed, from Mr. Clay's celebrated speech in 1850, that he had himself instituted a comparison between the alleged Compromise of 1820 and that of 1850, and his condemnation of the former.

He also read an extract from a speech of Mr. Clay in 1839, in which that gentleman declared that the liberty of the African in this country was incompatible with the welfare of the white man.

Mr. E. earnestly denounced the excitement-producing fanatics of the North, who got up Tabernacle meetings, &c.; but he believed that the *people* of the North, when correctly informed, are always sound and honest. They are a thinking and reasoning people, and will decide aright.

Mr. E. was still speaking when our report closed.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

HYMN TO THE WINDS.

BY LYDIA A. CALDWELL.

Oh! wild, wild Winds! your awful-toned careering
Wakes all the grandeur of this soul unfearing;
Rouses a tempest of sublime emotion,
Restless and heaving as the far-off ocean.

Long have ye slept, but gloriously ye waken,
Strong as the hills whose firm base ye have shaken,
Proud as this soul which counts you as its brothers,
Reckless and loveless as am I to others.

Come ye yet nearer! for your tread of thunder
Wakens in me no feeling of poor wonder.
Howl ye and shriek! your cries of phrensied madness
Fill me with joy, intoxicate with gladness.

Take me, I pray ye! as a leaf, as blossom,
Lift me and bear me on your heaving bosom;
Lending the impulse of your grandest passion,
Mould ye my thoughts to a diviner fashion.

Rage! for ye've roused me from my fever slumbers;
In a new rhythm will I write my numbers;
Proud as are ye, to your wild tone agreeing
Chime the full pulses of my poet being!

Rage! for I love you! and your awful power
Seems to my nature as its own true dower;
Thus will I struggle, and with strong endeavor
Roll my deep numbers through the world forever!

[COPYRIGHT SECURED BY THE AUTHOR.]

For the National Era.

THE LEGAL TENURE OF SLAVERY.

LETTER X.

COLONIAL AND SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION FAILED TO LEGALIZE SLAVERY—TESTIMONY OF SLAVEHOLDING JURISTS.

[CONCLUDED.]

To the Friends of American Liberty:

I cannot spare room for an exhibition of all the efforts he makes to find the origin of legalized Slavery, but gives up, in despair. In "the granted privilege by the Emperor, Charles I," he could not find "the first introduction of Slavery into the New World," for it "was intended as a means of enabling the planters to dispense with the Slavery of the Indians by their European conquerors." And he does not intimate that their Slavery was legal. He finally settles down upon this conclusion:

"However, we are *of opinion* that it *may* be laid down as a legal axiom, that in all Governments in which the municipal regulations are not absolutely *opposed* to Slavery, persons *already* reduced to that state may be *held* in it; and we also assume, as a first principle, that Slavery has been permitted and *tolerated* in all the Colonies established in America by European Powers, most clearly as relates to the blacks and Africans; and, also, in relation to Indians in the first periods of conquest and colonization."—Wheeler, p. 15. American Slave Code, p. 269.

"What a falling off is here!" Slavery, instead of requiring municipal law for its *establishment*, requires municipal law for its *prohibition!* If this be so, the decision of Judge Matthews in the case of *Marie Louise* may be questioned. Slavery becomes the condition of nature, and statute law must interpose before it can be displaced! In Maine and Massachusetts, where there are (probably) no statutes "absolutely opposed to Slavery," "persons *already* reduced to Slavery may be *held* in it!" A "glorious uncertainty of the law," when expounded to meet the anomalies of Slavery!

By the same "legal axiom," assault and battery, when once committed, might be continued legally, if there are no express statutes against it—a "legal axiom" that ignores or reverses common law!

Nothing short of positive, local, municipal law, be it remembered, can legalize Slavery. This is admitted. This is judicially decided. This was our starting point. Slaveholding judges ransack all the legal and historical archives of the country in quest of the said positive, local, municipal law. In vain! they can "*find no trace of it.*" They yield the point. They confess, frankly, the failure. "NONE HAVE BEEN FOUND, AUTHORIZING THE SLAVERY OF THE BLACKS." Very well—what next? A verdict for Freedom? No; an "*opinion*"—not a "municipal law," but only an "*opinion*"—not that it IS, but that "it MAY be" (whenever common sense and humanity permit it) "a legal axiom" that—that *what?* In substance, that any man that can "*catch a nigger,*" and fetter him, and drive him, may *legally* continue to do so, provided no "positive, local, municipal law" has been enacted against it! The law logic of John Hawkins revived again. Such are the shifts and exigencies of slaveholding, in quest of legalization!

After all, a closer scrutiny will perhaps enable us to recall the severity of this last remark, as applied to the amiable and discriminating Judge Matthews, however just it may be in its application to those who deliberately defend the legal tenure of slaveholding.

Judge Matthews *does not say* that slaveholding was ever *legalized*, but only that it was "permitted and tolerated." He does not say that Slavery is *now* legal, but only that the slave "may be held" in his present sad condition, however the tenure (whether legal or otherwise) under which he is held may be described. Undoubtedly *he may*, but only because the guilty Government continues to "*tolerate*" the outrages it ought to suppress.

In saying that "Slavery was *tolerated* in all the colonies," Judge Matthews, by an obvious implication, *denied* that it had ever been *legalized*. No acute lawyer who uses legal terms with precision ever speaks of a practice which he considers legal as being *tolerated*. Governments *protect*, but do not *tolerate*, men in the enjoyment of their lawful *rights*. Abuses and nuisances are tolerated, but not innocent, lawful acts.

Judge Matthews then declined to liberate the slave, *not* on the ground that he was *legally* enslaved, but on the ground of the *tolerance* (forbearance) hitherto exercised, and which it was deemed difficult, inconvenient, incongruous, or ungraceful, for him, as a slaveholder among slaveholders, to terminate. Thus Madison continued a slaveholder, though he denied the legality of property in man, and would not consent that the Federal Constitution should contain an admission of its legality. On the whole, it is not to be admitted that a jurist of Judge Matthews's attainments and standing would stultify himself by admitting the legality of slaveholding, after having declared that it *could not* be legalized without positive municipal law, "no traces" of which could be found! He did not do it, as his words show. He carefully and adroitly avoided doing it, though deciding against a claim for freedom. This fact is full of instruction, deserving to be studied and remembered.

The language and the course of Judge Matthews may remind one of an expression used by the celebrated Dr. Hopkins, who, in his writings, charges the magistrates with "*conniving* at the practice" of slaveholding. This meaning is evident from the consideration that magistrates are never said to "*connive*" at what is legal. Dr. Hopkins expresses himself in accordance with this, when he says, further, that our modern Slavery differs from the ancient, as being "*without the express sanction of civil Government.*"* Judge Matthews cannot be cleared from the charge of "*conniving*" at the practice, though he had too much intelligence and decency to pronounce it legal.

In the case of Hudgins *vs.* Wright, November term, 1806, the Court said: "The Slavery of the African negro has *existed* from the time of bringing them into the colony. In *many* of the States, *express enactments* have been made, declaring them slaves; in others, they are slaves by CUSTOM."—1. Henry and Munford's Virginia reports, 139; Wheeler's Law of Slavery, p. 12; Goodell's American Slave Code, p. 263.

This falls short of affirming the *legality* of Slavery in *any* of the States, and amounts to an implication that it is *not* legal in *some* of them. No one doubts that Slavery has *existed* from the period specified. So has petty larceny and many other unlawful practices. And the "express enactments" alluded to are not shown, nor even affirmed, to have been valid.

"In other (States) they are slaves by CUSTOM," that is, without the existence of "express statutes" or positive law; and, consequently, their Slavery is illegal.

In the case of Hall *vs.* Mullen, June Term, 1821, Judge Johnson said: "But the condition and rights of slaves in this State depend not exclusively on the civil or feudal law, but may, *perhaps*, rest upon *both*; subject, nevertheless, to such changes in their condition, &c., as the laws of the State may prescribe."—5 Har. & John's Maryland Reports, 190; Wheeler, pp. 10, 11; Slave Code, p. 264.

Here, again, we see an anxious and unsatisfactory search after the legal foundations and origin of Slavery. No mention is made of "municipal law"—"the laws of the State"—as having originated or legalized the relation, but only as regulating and changing its incidents. The Judge knew better than to attempt citing either the Statutes or the Constitution of Maryland, for the origin or legality of Maryland Slavery; so he goes back to the old (Roman) civil law, and to the feudal law, (once existing in Europe, but never in America) for their origin. Nothing of "local, municipal, positive law," can be predicated of these; and, consequently, nothing that could legalize Slavery, "the creature ONLY of municipal law. After all, the Judge finds that Slavery cannot "depend exclusively either on the civil or feudal law;" yet he consoles himself with the *conjecture, that "perhaps, it may* rest, in *part*, upon *both*," subject to such legislative regulation as shall prevent the inconvenient definition and limitation of Slavery to those less rigid standards. The legality of Slavery being thus (according to Judge Johnson) involved in doubt and uncertainty, he was bound to decide in favor of liberty, according to the common law maxim, "Whenever the question of liberty seems doubtful, the decision must be in favor of liberty."

I shall cite but one instance more. In the case of "The State *vs.* Waggoner, April Term, 1797," the Judge said: "They (Indians) have so long been recognised as slaves in our law, that it would be as great a violation of the rights of property to establish a contrary decision at the present day, *as it would in the case of the Africans, and as useless to investigate the manner in which they originally lost their freedom.*"—1 Halstead's New Jersey Reports, 374—476; Am. Slave Code, p. 265.

In this New Jersey decision, the more liberal and righteous doctrine of the Southern Courts, "that prescription is never pleadable to a claim for freedom," is entirely set aside. Prescription, or length of time, is made the *only* foundation of Slavery! Nothing is said of statutes, laws, constitutions, compromises, or understandings of any kind—nothing in the shape of "local, municipal, or positive law," in any possible form. The plain, unvarnished proposition is this: that long-continued practices, *whatever they may be*, are entitled to protection, and constitute law, unless special statutes abolish them. If this be so, then "legal science," "common law," and so forth, are mere phrases without meaning.

My main object in this letter was to show that there were no statutes creating the relation of Slavery during the colonial period. I have proved *more* than this, by the testimony of slaveholding jurists themselves, one of whom testifies that there were no such statutes in 1797, and the other, that none could be found in 1817. In the proper place I shall produce further testimony from slaveholding statesmen, and from the Federal Courts, affirming or admitting that no such statutes could be found in 1850 and 1853. But I must first show the illegality of Slavery from considerations and evidences of a different character and earlier date.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

* History of Slavery and Anti-Slavery, p 76.

☞ An old subscriber in Indiana, in renewing his subscription, furnishes a little gossip, which we are sure will interest our readers.—*Ed. Era.*

NORTH MADISON, IA., *Jan.* 11, 1854.

Mr. Hoyte was the first man that introduced me to the *Era*, and right glad I was, as it is just the kind of a paper I wanted. I like your London correspondent, as he wishes to conciliate and create a good feeling between this country and England. I think I made something from reading his letters. I had a good crop of wheat, and, as he said the English and French wheat harvests were deficient, I held on till I got a dollar for mine.

Mr. Greeley gave us a fine address at the State Agricultural Fair, and Senator Bright's paper, and some other Hunker Democratic papers, abused and misrepresented him for his pains. To show my respect for him, I have joined a club in Madison, who get the semi-weekly *Tribune* at $2, and have dropped the Madison *Banner*, that is afraid to say a word against Slavery, and the Cincinnati *Central Herald*, one of those religious papers that do a great deal of harm, by preventing people from subscribing to papers like the *Era*, that do so much good. I take the *Free Democrat*, and support the Madison *Courier*, because Mr. Bright attempted to put it down, for its Free-Soilism.

You have eleven readers in my family, three sons, three grandsons, three daughters, and the old couple. As I give them plenty of Free Soil papers, I have no doubt that they will all vote right, when an opportunity offers. But I am sorry to say that I do not know a single Irishman out of my own family that takes a Free Soil newspaper, or that voted for Hale and Julian. The Catholics go almost in a body with the Old Democrats. Some of the Orangemen vote the Whig ticket, because the Catholics vote the Democratic. They hate each other for the love of God! It seems to me strange, as all the leaders in Ireland were Abolitionists. I have a list of toasts that were drank in Belfast, on St. Patrick's day, 1817; the second toast is as follows:

"Civil Liberty and Political Independence to the People of every clime and of every color."

And O'Connell was so much opposed to negro Slavery, that he returned some money that was sent to him from slaveholders, and he always headed his addresses from the words of Byron: "Hereditary bondsmen, know you not, who would be free, themselves must strike the blow!" And the Catholic Bishop, Dr. Doyle, when writing against the tithe system, always headed his letters with the words, "Irishmen, may your hatred of tithes be as lasting as your love of justice."

It appears to me that their love of justice does not last long after they cross the Atlantic.

Dr. M., the leader of the Unitarian party in Belfast, was a strong Abolitionist. Before Mr. Polk's election, I wrote to my brother that I had built an addition to my house, and had hung Dr. M.'s portrait in the centre of the fire-place, and one of Washington on his right hand; and that when Mr. Polk was elected President, I would hang his on the doctor's left. He told my brother to say to me, that he did not think Mr. Polk was fit company for him, as he abhorred a slaveholder. Well, the doctor's son came over to New Orleans, and settled in the commission business, and got married to a rich lady, the owner of thirty slaves; and my brother wrote me, last summer, that he and his wife were expected over on a visit to his father, and that the doctor, who abhorred a slaveholder, was getting the house, green-house, and garden-gates, painted, walks gravelled, meeting-house and everything put in tip-top order, for the reception of the slaveholder and his lady!

John Mitchel, the escaped Irish convict, is a son of the late Rev. Mr. Mitchel, of Newry, another Unitarian clergyman. I have heard him preach, and have a volume of his sermons. He was a mild, good man, an Abolitionist, and opposed to a repeal of the Union, from interest and principle, for he had £100 a year, *regium donum*, from the British Government, besides his stipends from his congregation. I think he died before his son joined the repealers. Young Mitchel, as one of his neighbors tell me, studied law a while, and then started the *United Irishman*, a repeal newspaper, on speculation, and it paid well, it is said.

In his address to the Irish confederates in New York, he says: "After nearly six years of miserable slavery in a British penal colony." If he has suffered slavery so long, he should sympathize with the slaves of the United States, and he and Meagher start a Free Soil paper, and redeem the Irish character from the charge of selfishness; for the Irish appear to think no other people on earth deserving sympathy or liberty but themselves. I should except Mr. Meagher; he appears to be a very liberal Catholic.

The next we will have on the stage will be Smith O'Brien. He is an Episcopalian, and, if I recollect right, sat in Parliament with O'Connell, and O'Connell called him an impracticable. He refused to sit on committees, or to conform to the rules of the House, and was continually proposing measures that it was impossible to carry. His attempt to raise a rebellion in Ireland proves him to be a fool.

The British Government must have connived at their escape. She may be glad to have got clear of them; and it was certainly a great blessing to Ireland to have them transported. The country has made rapid progress in industrial pursuits since they left, as I learn from a lecture of Mr. O'Hagan, a talented young Catholic barrister, published in the Belfast *Northern Whig*, a paper I get; and when a Catholic speaks approvingly, we may believe him, as the Catholics are generally grumbling.

I remain yours, truly, J.

For the National Era.

LAND REFORM—ITS CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN AGRICULTURE.

Next to American Slavery, the subject of Land Reform, or the donation of the public lands, in *limited quantities, to actual settlers*, demands the immediate consideration of the American People. If we would prevent the evils of an excessive land monopoly, under which Europe groans, we must use the necessary and timely precautions. To the adoption of such a measure, we shall ultimately be driven. At the present ratio of increase of population of these United States, it is plain to see, not many centuries can elapse, before this whole American continent will become as densely populated as is any portion of the Old World.

It is estimated that our population *doubles* once in about twenty-five years. From the last census returns, it will be seen that our present population somewhat exceeds twenty-three millions, though, at present, I shall assume twenty-five millions as nearer the truth. It will be sufficiently accurate for my present purpose, and will not materially affect the conclusions, to assume this as the result of the census of 1850, upon which to base the following calculations:

Total population of the United States in 1850 - - -	25,000,000
Whole number of square miles of the United States and Territories - - -	2,500,000
Whole number of acres - - -	1,600,000,000

Number to the square mile, in 1850, 10; one century hence, 160; two centuries, 2,560. Number of acres to each in 1850, 60; one century hence, 4; two centuries, ¼. Population, one century hence, four hundred millions; two centuries hence, six billion four hundred millions.

One of two things is inevitable: either the ratio of increase will diminish, or such a result will follow. Taking into account the constantly increasing influx of population from abroad, together with the abolition of the great causes of depopulation, such as war, intemperance, American Slavery, (for we intend to have it abolished,) and a thousand other evils, which have for ages existed, and which are the result of popular ignorance—so sure as the promotion of popular education is calculated to dissipate the evils of ignorance—so sure as the millennial reign of justice, mercy, and truth, is about to be ushered in, will this ratio, instead of diminishing, continue to increase.

It is frequently asserted that the ratio of increase diminishes as the country becomes more populous; and, as a proof of this, we are referred to some of the most densely populated districts of the Old World—to China, for example. But is this the result of a necessary and unavoidable law of our nature, or is it the legitimate fruit of the violation of those laws? It should be remembered, that, as a general thing, the inhabitants of those districts are sunk in the grossest ignorance and superstition, and live in the most palpable violation of the laws of their physical and mental organization; but when, under our progressive system of popular education, these laws are better understood and observed, will the sources of depopulation, to a great extent, be dried up, and mortality become less frequent.

The original thirteen States embraced but a little more than a tenth of our present territory, their area being not much larger than Oregon Territory; and, at the period of the American Revolution, they contained but about one-tenth of our present population. How marked the change!

Within two years after the acquisition of California, and the discovery of gold, a great State bounds into the Union, with a population and resources exceeding some of the original members of the Confederacy. We now number thirty-one States and six Territories, with a population of about twenty-five millions.

We have said that the whole number of square miles of the United States and Territories is about 2,500,000—1,600,000,000 acres, which would give our entire population sixty acres each. The population one century hence, at the present ratio, according to the above estimate, will be about four hundred millions, four acres to each individual. This, at the present time, would be considered a very small allowance; still, if the above calculations are correct, (as I think any one may satisfy himself, who will take the trouble to make the computation, that they are nearly so,) it is all a person can hold, without diminishing the portion of others.

We do not suppose that every individual is to become a landholder, but we do suppose that all who wish to become so, should have the privilege; and, to this end, equal privileges should be extended to all.

We hold that every individual, unless he has forfeited it, possesses an inherent right to a portion of the soil. The dictates of sound national policy, as well as of justice and equity, clearly indicate that these rights should be exercised.

The same causes which have produced the system of landlordism in Europe, which has been productive of such a vast amount of misery, and which has driven so many thousands to our own shores, are, to a certain extent, in existence here, and will, if not removed, *ultimately* produce the same effects.

The advocates of land monopoly, in this, as in every other country, are generally men of wealth and capital, and hence possess an almost unlimited amount of power and influence. Many of them are Government functionaries, and manage to bend to their wishes all its immense power and patronage. They are aiming to establish a great *moneyed aristocracy*, by means of which they hope to control the suffrages of the people, and thereby the affairs of State; and hence it is only by the most strenuous exertions that the advocates of *free labor* and *free trade* can at all compete with them.

The subject of land reform is intimately connected with the subject of Slavery; indeed, Slavery can only successfully exist except through a monopoly of the soil. Hence, the desperate efforts which are being made by the slave propagandists to extend the area of Slavery to the Pacific, and thus secure to Slavery a vast amount of territory, as the only sure means of affording to the slave States a market for their surplus *cattle*. Prohibit, by timely legislation, this tendency to excessive land monopoly, and you strike an effectual blow against Slavery.

True statesmanship looks to *ultimate* consequences. We discourse largely and eloquently upon the evils which afflict the laboring classes in the Old World, while, at the same time, we are fostering the same or similar causes which produced them.

The agricultural interests of this nation *demand* restrictive measures upon this subject. Destined as America is to become the future home of almost countless millions of human beings, it becomes a matter of the greatest importance, that the inherent right to a portion of the soil should not become alienated. It is one of the plainest dictates of reason and common sense, that those pursuits which contribute most essentially to the public welfare should receive the greatest amount of Government patronage. That art upon which a thousand millions of human beings are dependent for their daily sustenance, in the prosecution of which are embarked nine-tenths of all the fixed capital of the civilized world, and upon which, probably, two hundred millions of human beings expend their daily toil, must, confessedly, be the most important of all — the parent and precursor of all other arts. In proportion as agriculture is more important than any other department of labor, should it receive the stimulating, encouraging, and fostering care of the Government, and, if need be, Governmental appropriations of the most princely munificence. The agriculturist, more than any other individual, needs to appreciate the dignity and importance of his vocation.

We regard a correct system of agriculture as indispensable to national happiness and prosperity. Other things being equal, a nation is prosperous and happy in proportion as its agriculture is thriving and prosperous. Under a correct system of agriculture, there is hardly setting any limits to the productions of the soil. It can be made to produce almost indefinitely, (as, did my limits permit, I would like to show;) and this result can only be secured by the general dissemination of agricultural truth, of *vegetable physiology*, and of the principles of domestic and political economy. An individual having no interest in the soil will not be likely to pursue a course consistent either with his employer's interest or an enlightened public policy.

The tendency of an excessive land monopoly is to render the interests of the mass subservient to the few, thereby inducing popular ignorance—itself a prolific source of misery and misrule.

We have said, the same causes which have produced the system of *landlordism* in Europe, are, to a certain extent, in existence here, and will, if not removed, *ultimately* produce the same effects. The number of landholders in Britain is, comparatively, very few. The great mass of the people are landless, homeless, mere tenants at will, and are dependent on the landlords for employment and the means of subsistence. The consequence is, they are obliged to labor for what they can get; and if they are not satisfied with that, they are told to help themselves; indeed, it has been made the duty of the magistrates to get together and fix the wages of the laborer, making it a penal offence for the employer to give, or the laborer to receive, more than a certain fixed sum, which, in many cases, has been as low as four shillings, and from that to six shillings per week, though at the present time they are, in general, better paid.

What should we think, in this country, should the magistrates have the power to fix the wages of the laborer? And yet that it has been customary to do so in England, is a matter of history. And what are the causes which have contributed to such a state of things? Evidently, the system of land monopoly is the most prominent one. But I cannot dwell on these points. In view of the rapidly increasing population of these United States, and the great accessions to our population from abroad, it becomes a matter of the greatest importance, that those principles upon which, alone, the *maximum* products of the soil can be attained, should be adopted. The time must *ultimately* arrive—and that time is not so far distant as many seem to suppose—when every *foot* of arable soil must be brought into requisition, to support earth's teeming millions. The present system of agriculture will soon become wholly inadequate to meet the demand. The average products per acre must not only be two, three, four, as they are capable of being, but must be increased to at least ten, if not twenty fold.

Finally, it would be a great source of *revenue* to the Government, as it would tend to the rapid settlement of the public lands, thereby greatly increasing the agricultural products of the nation, and which, under an equitable system of *direct* taxation, would supersede the necessity of *tariffs* and restrictions on commerce, and would amply suffice to meet all the necessary expenditures of the Government. The pecuniary interests, therefore, of this nation, the dictates of sound national policy, as well as of justice and equity, *demand* the incorporation of this measure into our bill of rights, as one of the great and fundamental principles of the Democratic creed.

Resolved, therefore, That the donation of the public lands, in *limited* quantities, to *actual settlers*, is sound national policy.

The discussion of this subject incidentally involves, to some extent, the discussion of other kindred subjects—as revenue and its sources, the tariff, and sales of the public lands—which I must defer to a future occasion.

J. C. W.

Whiteford, Mich., Jan. 10, 1854.

MEMORIAL OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, &c.,

AGAINST THE INTRODUCTION OF SLAVERY INTO NEBRASKA.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

The Memorial of the Representatives of the Religious Society of Friends, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and parts adjacent,

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

That the religious Society of Friends has long held, and openly professed to the world, an unwavering conviction that the holding of our fellow-men in bondage, as now practiced in many parts of the United States, is totally irreconcilable with the just and benign principles of the Christian religion. It requires no argument to show, that where the injunction of our blessed Redeemer, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also even so unto them," is duly regarded, there Slavery must cease.

To us it appears clear, that a system which had its origin in violence, and is alone maintained by arbitrary power, which subjects men and women to the irresponsible control and disposal of persons with like passions as themselves, must inevitably tend to the injury both of the master and the slaves, be inimical to the social and political welfare of our beloved country, and prevent the maintenance of that high standard of moral and religious obligation which the Gospel enjoins.

We are also fully persuaded, that hereditary and involuntary servitude is wholly repugnant to the just and liberal principles upon which the people of these United States assumed their station among the nations of the earth. The declaration that "all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and that Governments were instituted to secure those rights, must, if carried out in practice, annihilate Slavery wherever it exists.

It was for the support of the Declaration in which this doctrine is conspicuously set forth, that the Congress of 1776 pledged themselves to each other; and the people of the United States, in the Constitution from which Congress derives its authority, declare that, among the objects they had in view in framing the Government, were "to establish justice," to "promote the general welfare," and "to secure the blessings of liberty."

Neither in the preamble, nor in the Constitution itself, do we find an intimation of any power or authority being conferred upon Congress to promote the system, or to extend the area, of Slavery. On the contrary, it was well understood at the time that Constitution was adopted, and for many years thereafter, that Slavery was expected to run its course and expire in the States where it then existed, without spreading its blighting influences over any others. The history of the times confirms this statement, and we have a striking illustration of its truth in the Ordinance of 1787, enacted by the Congress of the Confederation, and ratified by the first Congress under the present Union. By this law, hereditary Slavery is forever excluded from the Territory on the northwest of the Ohio, the only one then held by the United States. The wisdom of this measure has been conclusively demonstrated, by the unparalleled prosperity, and growth in population and wealth, of the States which have been formed out of that region.

In the gradual diffusion of light and knowledge, the manifold evils of Slavery have commanded the attention of the professors of the Christian religion, and so far been condemned, that nearly all those Governments of the civilized world, which at one time sanctioned the iniquitous system, have passed laws prohibiting it within their jurisdiction; and the few which still tolerate its existence, with the exception of our own, are now entertaining or maturing plans for its gradual or more speedy extinction.

Impressed with these considerations, we have seen, with feelings of deep concern and sorrow, that a Bill is now before Congress for the establishment of two Territorial Governments, in that section of country called Nebraska, legalizing the existence of Slavery there, and providing that when any portion of it shall hereafter be admitted into the Union as a State or States, it shall be received with or without Slavery, as the people applying for admission may elect.

We feel a lively interest in the fair fame and well-being of our beloved country, and in the Christian character and stability of its Government, which claims to be pre-eminent in recognising the rights of man, and securing the enjoyment of those rights to all; and we feel ourselves called upon, by an imperative sense of duty, as Christians and as citizens, respectfully but earnestly to remonstrate against the passage of the Bill in question, with the provisions alluded to; or to any other legislative enactment by which Slavery, now so generally recognised as a crying evil, and one of the darkest blots upon professing Christendom, may be introduced into any part of the United States from which it is now legally excluded.

Instead of opening new Territory to the paralyzing and deeply injurious influences of this system, and thus multiplying the wrongs and cruelties which it inflicts upon its unoffending victims, our fellow-beings, entitled equally with ourselves to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and social and domestic comforts, and who are alike the objects of that salvation purchased for all by a Saviour's blood, we believe the Divine call to the rulers of the nation is to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, that so the blessing of him that is ready to perish, and hath none to help him, may come upon them.

Besides the evils resulting from Slavery, which of themselves form an unanswerable objection to the proposed legislation, we conceive that the permission to introduce Slavery into any part of the Territory in question would be in direct violation of the Missouri Compromise act, passed by Congress in 1820, which declares, "That in all that Territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, not included in the State contemplated by this act, SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, SHALL BE AND IS HEREBY FOREVER PROHIBITED."

In this act, the faith of the Government was solemnly and irrevocably pledged to leave this condition of the Compromise forever undisturbed. The fact is indisputable, that such was the general understanding of the law at the time of its enactment, and that but for this conviction and assurance, Missouri could not have been admitted as a slave State.

But the bill now before Congress contemplates the abrogation of this contract, and the virtual repeal of the eighth section of the law; thus throwing open that vast tract of country to Slavery and involuntary servitude, which were by its provisions forever excluded therefrom.

If the Supreme Legislative Council of the nation can thus violate the pledge and annul a compact which it has deliberately formed, what confidence can be reposed in the probity of the Government, or what security is there for the rights and the liberties of the people. It is giving the sanction of its high example to practices which, if carried into the concerns of private life, must be destructive to the integrity and truthfulness of the community. We sincerely hope, for the reputation of our common country and of its Government, that this obvious dereliction from fidelity to contracts may be rejected.

The Sovereign Ruler of the universe, who holds in his hand the destiny of nations, has declared, by his inspired servant, that "he who ruleth over men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God." He can control the kingdoms of men, and set up or pull them down, as He sees will most conduce to the spread of universal righteousness. None are so great or so powerful that He cannot punish them; none so weak and low as to be beneath His notice and protection. Many are the instances on record, where He has been pleased to bless and prosper a Government administered in His fear for the general good of the people; and though He is long-forbearing, and slow to anger, yet there are also many proofs that national sins have incurred His just displeasure, and drawn upon their authors national calamities.

We fervently desire that it may please Him to influence those to whom the legislative authority is intrusted, with the wisdom which cometh from above, which "is pure, peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and of good fruits," that thus they may conduct the concerns committed to them, so as to secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessing of Heaven, and to render this great and growing Republic a model of wise and virtuous government, and a praise and glory in the earth.

Signed by direction and on behalf of a meeting of the Representatives aforesaid, held in Philadelphia, the 3d day of the second month, 1854.

WM. EVANS, *Clerk.*

From the New York Evening Post.

THE VOICE OF THE FREE STATES ON THE NEBRASKA QUESTION.

With the exception of what appears in the Albany *Argus*, and a few other prints of the Law and Croswell faction, not a word in favor of the Nebraska fraud appears in the presses of the free States, which is not dictated from Washington and published to order. The faint and timorous assent to that fraud expressed in the resolutions of the Democratic General Committee of this city, was of that description. The Boston *Post*, the New Hampshire *Patriot*, the Philadelphia *Pennsylvanian*, speak as they are bid—

"As the prompter breathes, the puppet squeaks."

The free expression of the North among all parties—whether enemies of the Administration or friends, whether Democrats or Whigs—is openly, earnestly, uncompromisingly against the measure.

The other day we gave some examples of the disapproval with which the most conservative part of the religious community regard the repudiation of the Missouri Compromise, and of the universal hostility which the German part of our population bear to it. To this we must add, that the Address of the Members of Congress who first took ground in opposition to the measure, is now extensively circulated in the German language. The New York *Demokrat*, now lying before us, contains the entire Address, in German.

Meantime, every day brings us new and stronger manifestations of the public feeling on this question. We give a few examples from journals just received, and now before us.

PUBLIC OPINION AT THE EAST.

We could hardly ask a more significant indication of the universal feeling in the Eastern States on the question of repudiating the Missouri bargain of 1820, than the one which we are about to lay before our readers. Among the journals at the East, which have most warmly supported the Compromise of 1820, and most earnestly deprecated any further discussion of questions connected with Slavery, is the Hartford *Times*, a daily paper published at the seat of Government in Connecticut, very widely circulated, and possessing, perhaps, more influence with the Democratic party than any other journal in the State. It took part early in counselling assent to the Compromise of 1850, supported Mr. Cass in the election of 1848, and has ever since been almost ferocious in its opposition to the Free Soil heresy. It has, moreover, distinguished itself as a zealous friend of the present Administration.

We have now before us the Hartford *Times* of yesterday, in which the leading article is a vehement attack upon Mr. Douglas's bill, occupying two columns of the paper. After a statement of the question, and some historical facts connected with it, the Hartford print says of Douglas's bill:

"This uncalled-for movement—this out-of-the-way, over-the-fence dash of the Senator from Illinois—astonished the country. The fact that such a measure was seriously proposed could not readily be comprehended. No *Southern* member of Congress could be found to propose it. The bill was thrust into their faces, and they were told that we, of the free States, who are in this movement, will make some more slave territory for you, from the lands which you of the South have agreed shall be free forever, an arrangement which you have adhered to in good faith as true men and honorable legislators. *We* will make this free territory into slave territory without your asking, though you have taken all that was conceded to Slavery, and made slave territory of it. * *

"But what is the reason given by Senator Douglas for his uncalled-for measure? Why, freemen of the North and South! surprising enough, it is simply this, and nothing more: He says that the Compromise measures of 1850 repealed the Compromise act of 1820—that the Compromise of 1850 established *a principle*, viz: that Territories may come into this Union with or without Slavery, as the people within their limits shall determine. If so, why the necessity of the present bill? But Senator Douglas has not the audacity to say that the Missouri Compromise was alluded to in either of the laws comprising the Compromise of 1850—he is forced to reach far over, and drag in the idea, that as New Mexico was organised as a Territory, with the privilege of coming in as a State with or without Slavery, as her people may elect, Nebraska shall come under the same head, though a law already exists relative to Slavery over the Territory of Nebraska which never extended to New Mexico. It is an absurd doctrine. As well might the argument be set up, that the State of California was admitted by the Compromise of 1850, with a clause in her Constitution positively prohibiting Slavery; and that it follows that every other State, whether formed from the present limits of Texas or any other portion of our territory, shall also be free from the institution of Slavery."

After some further argument to show that each of the Compromise measures of 1850 was discussed and passed on its own merits, and had an application to its own specific locality, and not beyond, and after some commendation of these measures generally, the *Times* closes its argument thus:

"If this dodge takes well, Douglas hopes to ride his hobby round the country and into the White House? But will it take? Will the people swallow the thing, and consent that useless agitations about Slavery shall be *created* and sprung upon them, for the sole object of carrying upon their angry waves some ambitious politician to the Presidency, who can never hope to get there by any other or fairer means? We feel assured of one thing: that the men who have proposed this last card of Slavery agitation will themselves fall far short of their political aspirations, whether they shall be able to push their bill suddenly through Congress or not. We hope and trust that the bill, so far as it relates to the Missouri Compromise, will be defeated. We have had quite enough of this Presidential hobby-riding on Slavery agitation. It is annoying to the peace of our country, and an outrage upon the good feelings of the people, North and South. The sooner the people crush all such movements to the earth, the better it is for them and the welfare of the Union. The country has not called for a repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The South has not called for it. The North certainly has not. No party, no section, no public sentiment, has called for it. Why, then, was it thrust upon Congress at this time?"

PUBLIC OPINION AT THE WEST.

What people in Illinois think of the Nebraska question may be inferred from the following article, which we take from the *Democratic Press*, a Chicago journal, in founding which Mr. Douglas took a prominent part—which is reputed, in fact, to have been established by him, and to be, more than any other journal, his personal organ.

This print, conducted by a nucleus of the faction, has been obliged to take ground in opposition to the repudiation of the Missouri Compromise. Its disapprobation of the measure is, to be sure, cautiously expressed; but it is the strongest indication which could be given of the entire unanimity of opinion on this subject in Northern Illinois. We quote from the *Democratic Press:*

"*A Word of Caution.*—The attempt now being made in Congress to repeal the Missouri Compromise will give rise to not a little excitement. We believe the matter will find no favor with the Democracy of Illinois, however much they may dislike to differ with Senator Douglas. Duty to themselves, to their country, and the best interests of their party, will have much greater weight with them than mere personal considerations. Such is our estimate of the sterling Democracy of Illinois, and we think we only do them justice. A word of caution, however, may not be amiss at this juncture. There are many men who will oppose this measure simply because it was introduced by a distinguished member of the Democratic party. There are some that will oppose it, who hold to many wild and absurd vagaries upon the subject of Slavery, the realization of which would explode our Union into fragments. Both these classes will endeavor to induce Democrats to become identified with them in opposing the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—the one class with the view of impairing the integrity of the Democratic party—the other class with the view of adding a seeming strength to their impracticable position. Now, our advice to Democrats is to keep as clear as possible of both classes. What we do in carrying out our convictions of duty in opposition to the repeal of the Compromise of 1820, let us do as Democrats, and in concert with Democrats. Any other course of action will impair the force of our efforts."

The Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives, with the exception of Richardson, who is an humble follower of Douglas, will probably oppose the Nebraska fraud. We look to Col. Bissell, who is neither wanting in political nor personal courage, to take a decided stand against it.

One of the late supporters of Douglas's claims to the Presidency, in Wisconsin, the Ozaukee *Times*, says:

"This Senator Douglas, it will be recollected, we supported as a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1852. Our cheek tingles with shame at the remembrance that we ever, in the most remote degree, assisted to add to the political prominence of so servile a doughface."